THE CHURCH HISTORY

Clear'd from the

Roman Forgeries

And Corruptions found in the

COUNCILS and BARONIUS:

FROM

The Year 400, till the end of the Fifth General Council, *An. Dom.* 553.

Being the Third and Fourth Parts of the Roman Forgeries.

By THOMAS COMBER, *D.D.*
Dean of DURHAM.

For we have not followed cunningly deviſed Fables,
2 Pet. I. 16.

LONDON.
Printed by *Samuel Roycroft*, for *Robert Clavell* at the *Peacock* at the Weſt-End of *S. Pauls*, 1695.

UMI

TO THE

Moſt Reverend Father in GOD,

JOHN,

By Divine Providence

Lord Archbiſhop of YORK,

Primate of *ENGLAND*,

AND

METROPOLITAN.

May it pleaſe your Grace,

WHen I formerly had the Honour of Your Acquaintance, tho' at a diſtance, I reckon'd it none of my leaſt Felicities: But ſince that

974960

that happy Providence that delivered theſe Nations, brought Your Grace nearer, to Illuſtrate theſe Northern Regions with Your excellent Doctrine, and warm them with Your pious Example; I could not better expreſs my extraordinary Satisfaction and my Duty both, than by preſenting theſe Papers to Your Grace, who have ſuffered ſo much from the Romiſh Party, and done ſo much to prevent their once growing and dangerous Errors.

Theſe Collections were all made, when this Church was threatned to have their Corruptions impoſed on us; and the Firſt Part was ready for the Preſs while that Cloud hung over our Heads. This Second Part hath been hindred

dred by divers neceſſary Avocati-ons, but now comes to appear under Your Grace's auſpicious Patronage; and if it be ſo happy alſo to gain Your Approbation, that will recommend it to all that know Your Grace's ſolid Judgment and Undiſguiſed Integrity. Frauds and Forgeries are naturally Your Averſation, and therefore the diſcovery of ſo great a heap of them, may I hope be acceptable to Your Grace; not on your own Account, to whom probably here is nothing New; but becauſe this Eſſay may aſſiſt young Divines and ſuch as begin to read Church-Hiſtory, at a cheap and eaſy rate to diſtinguiſh Truth from Falſhood in matters of great importance. I ſhall add no more,

ſince

ſince to give your Grace your juſt Character, is as needleſs as it would be difficult for me, and would not be pleaſing to your Grace; only I ſhall moſt heartily pray, *That the Church may be long happy in Your Conduct, and that he may be reckoned among Your Grace's Friends,* who is,

My Lord,

Your Grace's moſt faithful

Servant, and Your

True Honourer,

THO: COMBER.

THE PREFACE.

ANTIQUITY *ſeems ſo Naturally to challenge Veneration from all ſucceeding Times, that it gives a Value to many things which have nothing elſe to recommend them: But the Records of former Ages, eſpecially thoſe relating to the Faith and Practice of the Church, while it was in its purity and ſplendor, are by all ſober Men accounted truly Sacred. Yet no Writings have ſuffered more by fraudulent Hands than theſe: For moſt of them being for many Ages in the cuſtody of thoſe, who had a new Authority to ſet up, and were to contrive new Doctrines to furniſh and ſupport it with Wealth and Power, their Intereſt obliged them to corrupt all genuine Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and to invent innumerable ſpu-*

rious Pieces, under great and ancient Names, thereby to impose upon the ignorant Ages, and make them imagine, their later Devices were of Apostolical, or at least Primitive Original: And this is done with so much Artifice and Cunning, that a careless Reader of the Ecclesiastical Story (as they represent it) is in danger of being persuaded, That the Modern Roman Church is in all things conformable to the Primitive, from which it differs as much as Darkness doth from Light: To prevent which fatal Mistake, I think no Time can be better spent, no Pains more usefully employed, than in correcting the History of the Ancient Church, and discovering the various Falsifications thereof.

Wherefore I have now pursued and enlarged my Design of remarking the Roman Frauds and Forgeries in their Editions of the Councils, and in Baronius, *by rectifying the History of the Church, and all Passages relating to it, as I go along; having proceeded as far as the Middle of the Sixth Century: A Period which contains Three of the first Five General Councils, and is memorable for variety of most important Transactions. It was in this time that the most refined Hereticks disturbed*

disturbed the Church, and the barbarous Nations broke into the Roman Empire, and setled in divers parts of it. And while the former employed the Pens of the Learned, and the later diverted the Thoughts of the declining Emperors, Rome *had an unlucky Opportunity to serve the ends of her aspiring Ambition, and to lay the Foundation of her future Grandeur: Which Projects were furthered by a great decay, not only of Learning, but of Piety and good Manners, toward the End of this time, which made way for divers Superstitions to creep into the Worship, and many Irregularities to grow up in the Discipline of the Christian Church. Yet still there were many Learned and pious Writers, who laboured to defend the Faith, to check all sorts of Usurpations, and to keep up the Primitive Purity and good Order: So that the Editors of these Councils and* Baronius *have been put to all their shifts, to feign an Agreement between the Records of this Period, and the Modern Doctrines and Practices of their Church, foisting in many Legends and spurious Tracts, and corrupting the Words, as well as forcing the Sense of the genuine Writings of these Ages.*

Of which Proceedings I was in hopes to have found, both an exact Account and a just Censure in the lately published Work of the Learned Monsieur Du Pin (*a*). *And it must be confessed he hath owned more of these ill Practices, than any Writer of that Church, and suffered for telling more Truth than the Roman Cause can bear. Yet after all, either by the prejudices of his Education, or the influence of his Superiors, and the disadvantage of his Circumstances, many things of this kind are omitted, which are necessary for us to know: And though I would advise Young Students of Ecclesiastical Antiquity (whose service I aim at) to Read those Elaborate Collections; Yet I cannot assure them, they may every where depend on them.*

(*a*) New Hist. of Eccles. Writers, &c. *Lond.* 1693.

The best method to know the wole Truth, is to Read over the Councils themselves, and compare them, as they go on, with Baronius's *Annals, and both with these brief Remarks; which will so unfold that Mystery of* Rome's *corrupting and falsifying the Church-History and Writings of these times, that a diligent observer will hereby be enabled (without a Guide) to discover more of these Errors, than our designed*

deſigned brevity would allow us to ſet down: And ſuch a Reader may not only ſafely peruſe the Hiſtorians and Diſputants of that ſide, but will ſoon arrive at the Skill to confute all their Arguments, which are ſupported by diſguiſing of Ancient Records: And as his diſcovery of the Roman Frauds, will give him a juſt averſation for that Church; ſo his ſeeing that our Church rejects theſe Arts of deceiving, and needs no falſe or feigned Evidence, muſt give him as true a value for it; ſince we appeal to all uncorrupted Antiquity, Our Paſtors can ſay with S. Peter, We have not followed cunningly deviſed Fables (*b*). *Deceit in Human Affairs, is equally Odious and Miſchievous: But in Religious Matters it is highly Impious and Intollerable; becauſe it not only miſleads Men in matters relating to their Eternal Salvation: But (as a Learned Prince uſed to ſay,)* it makes God himſelf an Inſtrument of the Crime, and a Party to the holy Cheat (*c*): *To this Horrid Degree of Guilt, may the deſign of impoſing falſe and gainful Doctrines drive partial Men. But the Miſchief is prevented as ſoon as*

(*b*) 2 Peter I. 16.

(*c*) Dum homines decipunt, Deum ipſum interponunt tanquam ſceleris mediatorem: Rex Alfonſ. apud Phil. Camerar. hor. ſubſ. Tom. III. pag. 127.

it

it is discovered; wherefore I hope these Papers, which so plainly expose this sort of Falsifications, may set the History of these Times in a clearer Light; and not only help to undeceive some well meaning and misled Romanists, but to Establish the Inquisitive and Ingenious Members of this rightly Reformed Church, for whose Safety and Prosperity the Author daily Prays, and to whose Service he Dedicates all his Labours.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

PART III. CENT. V.

Chap. I. *Of the Time before the Council of* Ephesus, Page 1

Chap. II. *Of the Time from the Council of* Ephesus, *till the Council of* Chalcedon, p. 47

Chap. III. *Of the Council of* Chalcedon, *being the Fourth General Council,* p. 84

An Appendix concerning Baronius's *Annals,* p. 122

Chap IV. *Roman Errors and Forgeries in the Councils, from the end of the Fourth Council, till* An. Dom. 500. p. 157

An Appendix concerning Baronius *his* Annals, p. 189

PART IV. CENT. VI.

Chap. I. *Errors and Forgeries in the Councils, from the Year* 500, *to the End of the Fifth General Council,* An Dom. 553. p. 218

An Epitome of Dr. Crakenthorp's *Treatise of the Fifth General Council at* Constantinople, Anno 553. p. 279

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

PAg. 10. lin. 11. read, fourth time, p. 14. l. 4. thoſe words *Quibus verbis, &c.* were to be in the Margen at (*), p. 15. l. 24. r. noting in the, p. 21. l. 18. r. prove themſelves, p. 26. l. 26. r. to aſſert, p. 51. l. 21. r. from giving, p. 62. l. 3. r. divers proofs, p. 64. l. 35. r. him by their, p. 66. l. 29. (dele) *when*, p. 68. l. 16. r. yet the inventor, p. 69. Marg. at l. 33, r. *amplificatorem*, p. 74. l. 5. r. That inded *Leo*, p. 76. l. 4. r. S. *Germanus*, p. 79. l. 24. r. a ſtrange aſſertion, ib. l. 32. r. a packed party, p. 80. l. 31. r. *Pulcheria*, p. 92. l. 21. r. forges the title, p. 108. l. 28. r. made to theſe, p. 113. l. penul. r. Emperors patronage, p. 134. l. 11. r. *Conſtantius* his time, p. 152. l. 16. r. the pilgrimages, p. 153. l. 17. r. Legates; of p. 161. *lin. ult.* & p. 162. l. 1. r. *Pontificate*, p. 279. l. 19. r. *Theodoret*, p. 289. l. 14. r. and again by, p. 301. l. 23. r. and *Marcian*, ib. l. 24. r. commend *Juſtinian*, p. 402. & 403. wrong numbred for 302. 303. p. 302. l. 13. r. *Agathias* (ibid.) *penult.* & *ult. r. Juſtin.*

Roman Forgeries IN THE COUNCILS.

PART III. CENT. V.

CHAP. I.

Of the time before the Council of Epheſus.

§. 1. THE Editors of the Councils being generally the Popes Creatures, ſeem not ſo much concerned to give us a true Account of what was done, as to make their Readers believe, that all the Affairs of the whole Chriſtian World were managed ſolely by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and every thing determined by his ſingle Authority: Thus the firſt Council of *Toledo* was (*a*) held in *Spain*, under *Patronus*, Biſhop of that City: The Title ſays it was held in the time of Pope *Anaſtaſius*, and notes *An. Do.* 400

(*a*) *Bin.* Tom. 1. Par. 2. pag. 596. *Lab.* Tom. 2. Col. 1222.

notes the Name of the Conſul for that year, 400. But *Baronius* finding an Epiſtle of Pope *Innocent* writ to a Council of *Toledo* five years after this (*b*) (relating to the Priſcillian Hereticks then abounding in *Spain*) purely to make us think the Biſhops of *Spain* could do nothing without the Pope, removes this Council down to the Year 405. Yet afterwards in his Appendix, perceiving the trick was too groſs, he recants that Chronology, and reſtores it to its true Year *Anno* 400. (*c*) But after all, this Epiſtle of Pope *Innocent* is by ſome ſuſpected to be forged; and *Sirmondus* confeſſeth, that all the Old Books cite this Epiſtle as written to a Council at *Tholouſe* (*d*); ſo that he and *Baronius* probably altered the reading, and put in *Toledo* inſtead of *Tholouſe*, becauſe this was the more Famous Council; and they had a mind it ſhould be thought that all eminent Councils expected the Popes Letters before they durſt act: Whereas this Council of *Toledo* makes it plain, that they cenſured the Priſcillianiſts, and abſolved ſuch as recanted purely by their own Authority. And when they thought fit to acquaint other Churches abroad with what they had done, they ſend an Embaſſie, not only to the Pope, but to *Simplicianus*, Biſhop of *Milan*, whoſe Judgment and Authority they value as equal with the Popes (*e*). And here we muſt obſerve, that *Baronius* and the Annotator (ſeeing it was a reflection upon the Popes to have a Biſhop of *Milan* ranked equal with the Pope) affirm (without any Proof) that St. *Ambroſe* and his Succeſſor *Simplicianus* were only the Popes Legates, and that theſe Spaniſh Biſhops would communicate with none but ſuch as the Apoſtolical See did communicate with (*f*). Whereas they have the principal regard to the See of *Milan*, and in the definitive Sentence name only St. *Ambroſe* (*g*), though ſome Forger hath there manifeſtly put in theſe words, *add alſo what* Siricius *adviſed:* And in the Council of *Turin*, which *Baronius* cites, St. *Ambroſe* is named before the Pope; yea it is manifeſt by divers African Councils *, that they gave equal reſpect at leaſt to the Judgment and Authority

(*b*) Epiſt. 23. P. *Innoc.* ap. *Baron.* An. 405. pag. 235.

(*c*) *Baron.* Append. ad Tom. 5. pag. 691.

(*d*) *Lab.* pag. 1279.

(*e*) *Bin.* pag. 602. & not. pag. 606. *Lab.* col. 1231. not. col. 1240.

(*f*) *Bin.* notis.

(*g*) ut ſupra: ita *Lab. Baron.*

* About this time.

Authority of the Biſhop of *Milan*, as to thoſe of *Rome*(*f*). So that it is ridiculous and abſurd to fancy that St. *Ambroſe* and his Succeſſors (who were greater Men than the Popes for Learning and Reputation) were the Legates of *Rome*; and this hath been invented meerly to aggrandize that See. And for that ſame reaſon they have ſtuffed into the Body of this Council a Rule of Faith againſt the Priſcillianiſts, tranſmitted from ſome Biſhop of *Spain* with the Precept of Pope *Leo*, who was not Pope till forty years after this Council (*g*). Yea, *Binius* in the very Title of this Council, would have it confirmed by another Pope that lived divers Centuries after, of which *Labbè* was ſo aſhamed, that he hath ſtruck that whole Sentence out of his Edition (*h*). As to the Canons of this Council I ſhall only remark: That the firſt of them lays a very gentle puniſhment upon Deacons and Prieſts who lived with their Wives, before a late Interdict, which is no more but the prohibiting them to aſcend to any higher Order (*i*). And no wonder they touched this point ſo gently, for this prohibiting Wives to the Clergy was never heard of in *Spain* till *Siricius* (who died about three years before) adviſed it in his Epiſtle to *Himerius*, and therefore *Innocent* in his third Epiſtle ſaid, Siricius *was the Author of this form of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline*, that is, of the Clergies Celibacy: and adds, *that thoſe who had not received his Decree were worthy of pardon* (*k*): And by the many and repeated Canons made in *Spain* afterward in this Matter, it appears, the inferior Clergy would not follow the Popes advice. The fourteenth Canon (*l*) ſhews that the Primitive way of receiving the Communion, was by the peoples taking it into their hands, as they do now in our Church: And the Notes confeſs, that the Roman Cuſtom of taking it into their mouths out of the Prieſts hand is an innovation (*m*), brought in after the corrupt Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation had begot many ſuperſtitious Conceits about this Holy Sacrament, the altering of the Doctrine occaſioning this change in the way of receiving: Whereas the Proteſtant Churches

(*f*) *Baron.* An. 405. & appen. ad Tom. 5. pag. 693.

(*g*) *Bin.* pag. 599. *Lab.* col. 1227.

(*h*) Vid. Titul. Concil. ap. *Bin.* & *Lab.*

(*i*) Concil. *Tol.* 1. can. 1. *Bin.* p. 597. *Lab.* col. 1223.

(*k*) *Innoc.* ep. 3. *Bin.* pag. 612. *Lab.* col. 1254.

(*l*) Concil. *Tol.* can 14. *Bin.* p. 598. *Lab.* col. 1225.

(*m*) Not. *Bin.* pag. 598. *Lab.* col. 1239.

which retain the Primitive Doctrine, keep alſo the Primitive Rite of Communicating. To this Council are tack'd divers Decrees which belong to ſome Council of *Toledo* or other; but the Collectors, *Burchard*, *Ivo*, &c. not knowing to which, have cited them under this General Title, *out of the Council of* Toledo, and ſo the Editors place them all here (*n*). But moſt of them do belong to later times, and the name of *Theodorus*, Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, in one of theſe Fragments ſhews it was made 300 years after this time (*o*).

(*n*) *Bin.* pag. 602. *Lab.* col. 1231.

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 604. *Lab.* col. 1236.

An. Dom. 401. We have in the next place two African Councils ſaid to be under *Anaſtaſius*, though indeed they were under the Biſhop of *Carthage*: The former of theſe, decrees an Embaſſie ſhall be ſent both to *Anaſtaſius*, Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Venerius*, Biſhop of *Milan*, for a ſupply of Clergy-men, of whom at that time they had great ſcarcity in *Africa* (*p*). The other African Council determines they will receive ſuch Donatiſts as recanted their Errors, into the ſame Orders of Clergy which they had, before they were reconciled to the Church, provided the Biſhop of *Rome*, *Milan* and other Biſhops of *Italy* (to whom they ſent a ſecond Embaſſie) conſented to it: Now here, though all the Italian Biſhops were applied to, and he of *Milan* by name, as well as the Biſhops of *Rome*; and though it was not their Authority, but their Advice and Brotherly Conſent, which the African Biſhops expected; yet *Baronius* and *Binius* tell us, *it is certain that* Anaſtaſius *did give them licence to receive theſe Donatiſts in this manner, becauſe St.* Auguſtin *ſaid they did receive them* (*q*). Whereas St. *Auguſtine* never mentions any licence from the Pope, and his leave or conſent was no more deſired than the leave of other eminent Biſhops, only the Annaliſt and his followers were to make this look as an indulgence granted from *Rome* alone.

(*p*) *Bin.* pag. 606. *Lab.* col. 1241.

(*q*) *Bin.* pag. 607. *Lab.* col. 1242. *Baron. An.* 401. pag. 130.

§. 2.

§. 2. Pope *Innocent* ſucceeded *Anaſtaſius*, who had the good fortune to be convinced (by St. *Auguſtine*, and other Biſhops more learned than himſelf) that *Pelagius* and *Celeſtius* were Hereticks, and ſo to joyn with the Orthodox in condemning them, for which he is highly commended by St. *Auguſtine*, St. *Hierom*, and by *Proſper*, who were glad they had the Biſhop of ſo powerful and great a City of their ſide; and ſo was poor St. *Chryſoſtom* alſo, whoſe Cauſe he eſpouſed when *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* and the Empreſs oppreſſed him; and by that means *Innocent* alſo got a good Character from St. *Chryſoſtom* and his Friends in the *Eaſt*: But ſome think it was rather his good fortune than his judgment, which made him take the right ſide: The Pontifical fills up his Life, as uſually, with frivolous matters (*r*). But two things very remarkable are omitted there, the one is a paſſage in *Zoſimus*, *viz.* That when *Alaricus* firſt beſieged *Rome*, and the Pagans there, ſaid the City would never be happy till the Gentile Rites were reſtored, *The Præfect communicates this to Pope* Innocent, *who valuing the ſafety of the City before his own Opinion, privately gave them leave to do what they deſired* (*s*). The other is, That when *Rome* was taken afterwards by *Alaricus*, Pope *Innocent* was gone out of the City to *Ravenna*, and did not return till all was quiet; and therefore I cannot with *Baronius* think that St. *Hierom* compares Pope *Innocent* to *Jeremiah* the Prophet (*t*); for *Jeremiah* ſtaid among God's People and preached to them, but *Innocent* was gone out of *Rome* long before it was ſeized by the Goths. Further we may obſerve, that whereas St. *Hierom* adviſed a Noble Roman Virgin to beware of the Pelagian Hereticks, *and to hold the Faith of Holy* Innocent (*u*): *Baronius* is ſo tranſported with this, that he quotes it twice in one year, and thus enlarges on it, *That St.* Hierom *knew the Faith was kept more pure and certainly in the Seat of* Peter, *than by* Auguſtine *or any other Biſhop, ſo that the Waters of Salvation were to be taken more pure out of the Fountain than out of any*

An. Dom. 402.

(*r*) *Bin.* pag. 607. *Lab.* col. 1242.

(*s*) *Zoſim.* hiſt. lib. 5. pag. 816.

(*t*) *Baron. An.* 410. pag. 301.

(*u*) *Hieron.* ad *Dem.* ep. 8. pag. 75.

(w) *Baron. An.* 413. pag. 354. & 358.

any Rivers (*w*); which abſurd Gloſs is eaſily confuted by conſidering, that this Lady was a Member of the Roman Church, and ſo ought to hold the Faith of her own Biſhop, eſpecially ſince he was at that time Orthodox; and this was all St. *Hierom* referred to: For he doth not at all ſuppoſe the Roman See was infallible, nor did he make any Compariſon between *Auguſtine* and *Innocent*, ſince he well knew that in point of Learning and Orthodox Judgment *Auguſtine* was far above this Pope, who indeed derived all the skill he had as to the condemning *Pelagius* from the African Fountains, and eſpecially from St. *Auguſtine:* Beſides, nothing is more common than for ſome Eminent Biſhops to be named as the Standard of Catholick Communion, not from any Priviledge of their See, but becauſe at that time they were Orthodox: So the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch* are named in a Reſcript of *Arcadius* the Emperor, with this Character, that ſuch as did not hold Communion with them ſhould be caſt out of the Church (*x*). And thus *Athanaſius*, *Ambroſe*, *Cyril* and others, eminent for being Orthodox, have been made the Touchſtones of Mens Faith, ſuch paſſing for true Believers only, who held the ſame Faith with them.

(x) *Baron. An.* 404. pag. 202.

For this Pope there are divers Epiſtles publiſhed, upon which and the partial Notes upon them we will make ſome brief remarks.

The firſt Epiſtle to *Decentius*, Biſhop of *Eugubium*, was writ the laſt year of *Innocent Anno* 416. (*y*) but is placed firſt, becauſe it talks big of St. *Peter*, and of the duty of other Churches to conform to the Roman uſages: But there are ſome paſſages in it which make it queſtionable whether this Pope writ it; or, if he did, ſhew his ignorance and groſs miſtakes; for the Author affirms, *That no Apoſtle but* Peter *did Inſtitute Churches, Ordain Prieſts and Preach in* Italy, France, Spain, Africa, Sicily *and the adjacent Iſlands* (*z*). Whereas the Scripture teſtifies that St. *Paul* did inſtitute the Church at *Rome* and preached in *Italy*; and moſt of the Eccleſiaſtical

(y) *Bin.* marg. pag. 609. *Lab.* marg. col. 1248.

(z) *Innoc.* ep. 1. *Bin.* pag. 608. *Lab.* col. 1248.

aſtical Writers affirm that St. *James* preached in *Spain*. 2*ly*. He enjoyns the *Saturday* Faſt (*a*) which was a peculiar Cuſtom of the Roman Church not obſerved in the *Eaſt*, nor at *Milan*, nor almoſt in any other Churches of divers Ages after; and we may obſerve that among all *Innocent*'s Reaſons for it, there is not one word of the Bleſſed Virgin, who was not worſhiped in thoſe days, as ſhe is now by the Romaniſts, who now pretend to obſerve this *Saturday* Faſt peculiarly to the honour of the Virgin *Mary*. 3*ly*. He allows not only Prieſts, but alſo Lay-Chriſtians to give extream Unction to the Sick, if the Oyl be but conſecrated by a Biſhop (*b*). In which point the Roman Church hath ſince altered her Opinion, and I doubt not but they will call this now, a manifeſt error.

(*a*) *Bin.* pag. 609. *Lab.* col. 1246.

(*b*) *Innoc.* ep. 1. §. 8. *Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* col. 1238.

The ſecond Epiſtle to *Victricius* (as *Labbè* confeſſeth) is patched up out of the fourth Epiſtle of *Siricius* and the ſeventh of Pope *Zachary* (*c*). And the Centuriators note concerning all theſe Epiſtles which go under *Innocent*'s Name, *That ſometimes whole Paragraphs are taken out of the Epiſtles of both former and later Popes* (*d*), which is a ground to ſuſpect that moſt of them are not genuine: However there hath been a later hand employed to foiſt in a paſſage or two into this Epiſtle; for whereas the Firſt Writer declares that, *all Cauſes ſhall be determined in the Province where they happen*, ſome have put in a Sentence [*excepting the reverence due to the Roman Church*] into the Body of the Section; and an exception of *reſerving the greater Cauſes for the Apoſtolick See*, in the end of that Section (*e*), which make the whole Decree null, and contradict the *Nicene* Canon cited there: And whereas the former ſentence was meer nonſenſe in *Binius*, *Labbè* hath put two words (*ſine præjudicio*) into his Edition, to make this groſs Addition ſeem coherent, and conceal the Forgery: Again, the Author of this Epiſtle in his zeal againſt the Clergies Marriage, falſly cites it for Scripture, *That God's Prieſts muſt marry but once* (*f*); and it is but a poor excuſe which *Labbè* makes, that *Tertullian* had cited this as out of

(*c*) *Bin.* marg. pag. 610, & 611. *Lab.* col. 1252, 1253.

(*d*) *Magdeb.* Cent. 5. pag. 1233.

(*e*) *Bin.* pag. 611. *Lab.* col. 1250.

(*f*) *Bin.* ib. §. 6. *Lab.* col. 1251.

of *Leviticus*, ſince the infallible Interpreter of Scripture ſhould have corrected his Error, and not have countenanced an addition to the Holy Text to ſerve an ill Cauſe. 3*ly*. The Writer ſhews himſelf groſly ignorant of the Courſes of the Jewiſh Prieſts, when he ſaith, *they did not depart from the Temple nor go to their Houſe in the year of their Miniſtration* (*g*). Whereas every one knows that there was but 24 Courſes of the Prieſts, and that every Family miniſtred but one Week at a time from Sabbath to Sabbath (*h*). Yet this Author makes the ſame miſtake again in the third Epiſtle, and confidently talks again of *the year of their Courſe*. 4*ly*. Whereas St. *Paul* had declared *Marriage honourable in all Men* (without excepting Miniſters) *and the Bed undefiled* (*i*). This Impudent Epiſtolizer calls the uſe of Marriage in the Clergy *a being ſtained with Carnal Concupiſcence*, and expounds that place, *Thoſe who are in the Fleſh cannot pleaſe God* (*k*); of ſuch Marriages (*l*), making the Apoſtle contradict himſelf by this ſenſleſs and falſe Gloſs: But notwithſtanding all theſe pernicious and abſurd Errors, *Baronius* and *Binius* do extreamly magnifie the Pope upon this occaſion, as being that *Original Fountain from whence the moſt Famous Biſhops of the World uſed to draw Water, knowing of what great Strength and Authority theſe things were which came from the Apoſtolical See* (*m*). But firſt, If theſe Epiſtles be forged (which is very probable) then all theſe brags and bold inferences are vain; if they be true and were writ by *Innocent*, they may juſtly bluſh, that ſuch poor ſtuff ſhould come from the Biſhop of ſo great a See; and however it will not follow that the Roman Biſhop was the Head of the Catholick Church, becauſe *Victricius* and *Exuperius* writ to him for advice. For how many more and greater Biſhops writ to St. *Baſil*, St. *Auguſtine*; yea to *Iſidore* of *Peleuſium* and St. *Hierom* who were only Prieſts? and how far do their Anſwers exceed thoſe of the Pope? Yet none will be ſo ridiculous to magnifie the See of *Cæſarea* or *Hippo*, or the Monaſteries of *Peleuſium* and *Bethlehem*, as if they were the

(*g*) Ibid. ap *Bin. Lab.* § 9.

(*h*) *See* Selden *of Chriſt's Nativity, pag.* 58, *&c.*

(*i*) *Heb. XIII.* 4.

(*k*) *Rom. VIII.* 8.

(*l*) Ibid. §. 9.

(*m*) *Not.* in ep. 2. *Bin.* pag. 612. *Lab.* col. 1253. *Baron. An.* 406. pag. 249.

the very Fountains of Religion, or theſe Perſons the Heads of the Catholick Church: I will only add, that *Oroſius* is noted by *Baronius* himſelf to have conſulted with St. *Auguſtine* and St. *Hierom*, (about matters of Faith, and greater concernment by far than theſe) and not with *Innocent* his pretended Original Fountain (*n*); ſo that every one doubtleſs did not take the Pope for the ſole infallible Oracle in thoſe days.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 414. pag. 363.

The third Epiſtle to *Exuperius* is liable to all the Objections againſt the former: *Labbè* ſaith *it is patch'd up out of* Siricius *Epiſtle to* Himerius, *the ſecond Epiſtle of* Celeſtine, *and one of* Leo *to* Theodorus (*o*); and therefore probably it is forged: Or if we grant it genuine, it looks not very favourably upon their Modern Pretence to Infallibility; for the Pope here ſays, *he will anſwer according to the meaſure of his underſtanding*; and confeſſes, *that by Conference he added to his Knowledge; and while he was anſwering others, always learned ſomething himſelf* (*p*). The Notes alſo are much miſtaken in arguing from two Biſhops enquiring of Pope *Innocent*'s ſenſe in ſome matters of Diſcipline, *That all the Catholick Church ought to keep the Decrees of the Apoſtolick See* (*q*). For there were many hundred Biſhops in thoſe and other Provinces, who never enquired after the Biſhop of *Rome*'s cuſtoms, nor deſired his advice; and it is very certain that divers of theſe pretended Decrees were not obſerved, no not in *France* (where theſe two Biſhops lived) for divers Ages after they are pretended to be ſent thither. Before I leave this Epiſtle I muſt obſerve, that the laſt Section about the Canon of Scripture, wherein all the Apocryphal Books are reckoned up as part of the Canon (*r*), is a groſs Forgery added to it 300 years after *Innocent*'s death; for *Creſconius* never ſaw this part of the Epiſtle, nor doth he mention it under this Head, though he cite the other parts of it; ſo that if the whole Epiſtle be not forged, yet this part of it is certainly ſpurious, and added to it by a later hand, as is at large demonſtrated by Biſhop *Coſens* in his Hiſtory of the Canon of Scripture, to which I refer the Reader

(*o*) *Lab.* col. 1254. &c. in marg.

(*p*) *Bin.* pag. 612. *Lab.* col. 1254.

(*q*) Notis *Bin.* pag. 613. *Lab.* col. 1257.

(*r*) Ep. 3. *Inno.* §. 7. *Bin.* p. 613. *Lab.* col. 1256.

der (*s*), noting only that the Council of *Trent* grounded their Decree about the Canon of Scripture, not upon genuine Antiquity, but palpable Forgeries and Corruptions.

(*s*) *Couſ.* Schol. Hiſt. An. 405. pag. 118.

In the following Epiſtles unto the twelfth, there is nothing remarkable, but ſome brags of the dignity of *Rome*, and many pretences to a ſtrict obſervance of the Ancient Canons, which were no where oftner broken than in that Church: Some think they are all forged, becauſe they want the Conſuls names (*t*). And the twelfth Epiſtle may paſs in the ſame rank, ſince it is dated with falſe Conſuls, *viz. Julius* the fourths time, and *Palladius* (*u*); but becauſe it ſeems to ſhew that the Pope took care even of Foreign Churches, *Baronius* reſolves to amend it of his own head, and puts in *Theodoſius* and *Palladius*, though ſtill the number is falſe (*w*); for *Theodoſius* was the ſeventh time Conſul with *Palladius*, not the fourth; and had not this Epiſtle made for the Popes Supremacy, the Annaliſt would not have taken pains to mend it.

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 614, &c. *Lab.* col. 1260, &c.

(*u*) *Bin.* pag. 615. *Lab.* col. 1264.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 416. num. 30. pag. 393.

The thirteenth Epiſtle, which paſſes in *Binius* for a famous teſtimony of *Innocent*'s zeal in diſcovering the Pelagians (*x*), and meriting Notes, is the ſame with the beginning of the ſecond Epiſtle of *Fœlix* the fourth (*y*); and *Labbè* ſaith it is a forgery of the counterfeit *Iſidore* (*z*). The fourteenth Epiſtle calls *Antioch* a Siſter Church, and from *Peters* being firſt there ſeems to confeſs it was the elder Siſter; and both that and the ſixteenth Epiſtle ſpeak of one *Memoratus*, which *Baronius* will not allow to be the proper name of a Biſhop, becauſe indeed there was no ſuch Biſhop in that time; ſo that he expounds it of *the Biſhop remembred*, that is, of *Paulinus*; but the ill luck is, that *Paulinus* is neither named before, nor remembred in either of theſe two Epiſtles (*a*). The Notes on the ſixteenth Epiſtle mention it as a ſpecial uſage of the Biſhop of *Rome*, not to reſtore any to his Communion, unleſs they were corrected and amended; but this was ever the rule of all good Biſhops, and of late is leſs obſerved at *Rome* than in any other Church. The eighteenth Epiſtle maintains a very

(*x*) *Bin.* pag. 616.

(*y*) *Bin.* Tom. 2. Par. 1. p. 637.

(*z*) *Lab.* marg. col. 1265.

(*a*) *Bin.* ut ſupr. *Lab.* col. 1256. *Baron. An.* 408. pag. 275.

a very odd Opinion, *viz.* That the Ordinations celebrated by Heretical Biſhops are not ſo valid as the Baptiſm conferred by them; and the Notes (*b*) own that the Perſons ſo Ordained may truly receive (as they call it) the Sacrament of Orders, and yet neither receive the Spirit, nor Grace, no nor a power to exerciſe thoſe Orders, which ſeems to me a Riddle. For I cannot apprehend how a Man can be ſaid *truly to receive an Office, and yet neither receive Qualifications for it, nor any Right to exerciſe it.* The twenty ſecond Epiſtle cites that place of *Leviticus, That a Prieſt ſhall marry a Virgin,* and affirms it as a Precept founded on Divine Authority; and he cenſures the Macedonian Biſhops as guilty of a breach of God's Law, becauſe they did not obſerve this Precept, which every one knows to be a piece of the abrogated Ceremonial Law; and the Annotator cannot with all his ſhufling bring the Pope off from the Hereſie of preſſing the Levitical Law as obligatory to Chriſtians (*c*): But there is one honeſt paſſage in this Epiſtle which contradicts what this Pope had often ſaid before of the ſinfulneſs of Prieſts Marriages; for here he ſaith, *The Bond of Matrimony, which is by Gods Commandment, cannot be called ſin:* However out of this Epiſtle (which is a very weak one, and dated only with one of the Conſuls names) the Editors feign a Council in *Macedonia* and a Meſſage ſent to the Pope for confirmation of their Acts (which doth not appear at all in the Body of the Epiſtle). And *Baronius* deſires the Reader to note, *How great Majeſty and Authority ſhined in the Apoſtolick See, ſo that it was deemed an injury to require the Popes to repeat their former Orders* (*d*). Whereas if this Epiſtle be not forged, it is no more but a nauſeous repetition of the ſame Orders which he and his Predeceſſors had given over and over; and the frequent harping upon the ſame ſtring, in all the Decretal Epiſtles, eſpecially as to the Marriage of the Clergy, ſhews how little Majeſty or Authority ſhined in the Popes, ſince all the Countries to which they ſent their Orders, ſo generally deſpiſed them, that every Pope for divers Ages

(*b*) *Bin.* pag. 618. *Lab.* col. 1270.

(*c*) *Bin.* pag. 619. *Lab.* col. 1272. not. 1276.

** *Bin.* pag. 701. *Lab.* 1524.

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 414. pag. 365.

was ſtill urging this matter without that effect which they deſired. The twenty third Epiſtle was writ to ſome Synod or other, they know not whether at *Toledo* or *Tholouſe*, as we noted before (*e*). And the Jeſuit *Sirmondus* in *Labbè*, by elaborate conjectures, and large additions (probably of his own inventing) had put it out more full, and adorned it with Notes (*f*), which pains the impartial Reader will think it doth not deſerve. The twenty fourth Epiſtle is dear to the Editors and *Baronius*, becauſe the Pope therein is his own witneſs, that *all Matters ought to be referred to his Apoſtolical See, and that the Africans application to him was a due Veneration, ſince all Epiſcopal Authority was derived from him* (*g*). 'Tis true, St. *Auguſtine* doth mention a Meſſage ſent to *Innocent* out of *Africa*; but he adds that, *he writ back according to what was juſt and becoming a Biſhop of an Apoſtolical See* (*h*). But as to this Epiſtle, beſides the hectoring language in the Preface, there is neither Style nor Arguments but what are deſpicable; and *Eraſmus* did long ſince juſtly ſay, *In this Epiſtle, there is neither Language nor Senſe becoming ſo great a Prelate* (*i*); ſo that probably the whole may be a Fiction of ſome Roman Sycophant, which is the more likely, becauſe *Labbè* owns that one of the Conſuls names is wrong, that is, *Junius* is put for *Palladius* (*k*): *Eraſmus* adds, that the twenty fifth Epiſtle is of *the ſame grain with the former* (*l*), the Style is no better, and the Matter of the ſame kind; for he brags that whenever Matters of Faith are examined, application muſt be made to the Apoſtolical Fountain. And yet this Pope, as the Notes confeſs, held the Euchariſt ought to be given to Infants, yea that it was neceſſary for them (*m*), that is (I ſuppoſe) for their Salvation: Now the Council of *Trent* hath determined otherwiſe, ſo that the Romaniſts muſt grant, this Pope erred even in defining things neceſſary to Salvation; unleſs they will allow the whole Epiſtle forged by ſome later hand, who (whatever *Binius* ſay to the contrary) hath dated it with the Conſuls of the year after *Innocent*'s death, according to the

(*e*) *Bin.* pag. 621. *Lab.* col. 1277.

(*f*) *Lab.* col. 1279.

(*g*) *Bin.* pag. 621. *Lab.* col. 1283.

(*h*) *Aug. Bonif.* ep. 106.

(*i*) Not. Marg. in Ep. 91. inter Ep. Aug. edit. Eraſm. p. 86.

(*k*) *Lab.* col. 1287.

(*l*) Not. marg. in 93 ep. inter ep. *Aug.* edit. *Eraſm.* p. 88.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 624. *Lab.* col. 1289.

the beſt Chronologers. The twenty ſixth Epiſtle (as the Notes confeſs) was writ to *Aurelius*, *Auguſtine* and three more eminent Biſhops of *Africa*, by Pope *Innocent*, to clear himſelf from the ſuſpicion of being *a Favourer and Protector of the Pelagian Hereſie* (*); and by computation alſo this proves the very year in which he died (according to moſt accounts). Now if in thoſe days it had been believed (as it is now at *Rome*) that the Pope had been Infallible, and could not err in Matters of Faith, no Man durſt have raiſed this ſuſpicion, nor would any have regarded it; and *Innocent*'s beſt way of vindication had been only to have told them he was Pope and ſate in the Holy Infallible Chair; but now his labouring to clear himſelf by an Epiſtle, ſhews it was poſſible he might err. As to the Epiſtle it ſelf, *Eraſmus* ſaith, Innocent *anſwers after his faſhion, being fierce rather than learned, and more ready to condemn than inſtruct* (n); and whoſoever reads it will find that to be a true Character of this Epiſtle: To theſe is ſubjoined a Letter of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s to *Innocent*, in Latin only in *Binius* (o), but in both Greek and Latin in *Labbè* (p). The Phraſe of which is ſo polite, the Matter ſo pious and ſolid, that Gold doth not excel Lead, more than this genuine piece of the Golden-mouth'd Father doth all the former Epiſtles of the Pope, who (if he writ thoſe Decretals) was far more below St. *Chryſoſtom* in Learning than he pretended to be above him in Dignity: I confeſs the Editors would perſuade us to think this Epiſtle was writ only to *Innocent*, and to him it is ſuperſcribed in *Savil*'s Greek Edition, thus, *To* Innocent *Biſhop of* Rome *; but the Roman Paraſites have added to this Title, *To my moſt reverend and pious Lord*; but this hath been lately invented, for [*Domino meo*] is not in the Title in *Baronius* (q). And the Epiſtle it ſelf ſeems plainly to have been written to many; for towards the end, he ſaith, *Therefore my moſt venerable Lords, ſince you ſee theſe things are thus, uſe your utmoſt ſtudy and diligence to repreſs this injuſtice that is broke into the Church* (r); and the Phraſe doth every where ſuppoſe it was writ to

* *Bin.* not. pag. 625. *Lab.* col. 1292.

(n) Not. *Eraſm.* in ep. 96. inter ep. *Auguſt.* pag. 90.

(o) *Bin.* p. 625.

(p) *Lab.* col. 1291.

* *Chryſoſt.* Tom. 7. pag. 154. edit. *Sav.*

(q) *Baron. An.* 402. pag. 192.

(r) *Bin.* pag. 626. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1300.

to divers Weſtern Biſhops; and *Baronius* in the end of the Epiſtle hath theſe words, *We have writ this alſo to Venerius* Biſhop of *Milan*, and to *Chromatius* Biſhop of *Aquileia* (*s*); *Quibus verbis Rom. Epiſcopi primatum erigit, iiſdem Venerij & Chromatij primatum erexiſſet* *: ſo that ſince St. *Chryſoſtom* writ to all the eminent Biſhops of *Italy* as well as to the Pope, it is unjuſtly done of *Baronius*, to ſay, *That* Chryſoſtom *fled to his only refuge*, viz. *to the Roman Church, which he knew to be above all other Churches, and to have power to correct the ill-deeds of others* (*t*). There is one thing more remarkable in this Epiſtle, St. *Chryſoſtom* tells the Weſtern Biſhops, that being oppreſſed by *Theophilus* and his party, he appealed (not to the Pope, but) to a Synod; yea, *Innocent* himſelf ſaith, *There was great need to have a Synod called for this cauſe of St.* Chryſoſtoms (*u*). So that neither did St. *Chryſoſtom* appeal to the Roman Church alone, nor durſt *Innocent* take upon him to judge in this matter. As for thoſe two Epiſtles of *Innocent*'s, one to *Chryſoſtom*, and another to the Clergy of *Conſtantinople* (which are certainly genuine, as being preſerved in *Sozomen* (*w*) and not derived from the Roman Mint); Theſe two Epiſtles (I ſay) are in an humble Style, and ſo well written (*x*) that they make all the former Decretals which come from *Rome*, juſtly to be ſuſpected as forged and ſpurious. The ſecond Epiſtle of *Chryſoſtom*'s which follows theſe two, ſeems alſo to have been written to other Biſhops as well as *Innocent*, for it runs generally in the plural number; but they who would have us believe the Pope alone did all the buſineſs of the Church, have falſified one place in it, where St. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, *ye have ſhewed your ſelves loving Fathers towards us:* There the Latin is in *Binius* in the ſingular, *Paternam erga nos benevolentiam declaraſti* (*y*). But *Labbè* thought fit to mend this corruption, and reads it in the plural, *declaraſtis*, ye have declared (*z*). But the groſſeſt Forgery of all in this cauſe of St. *Chryſoſtom* are the Letters that are pretended to paſs between *Innocent* and the Emperor *Arcadius*,

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 404. pag. 195.

* *Launoy* ep. 3. p. 15.

(*t*) Id. ibid. pag. 192.

(*u*) *Innoc.* ep. 29. *Bin.* pag. 627. *Lab.* col. 1304.

(*w*) *Sozom.* lib. 8. cap. 26. pag. 471, &c.

(*x*) *Bin.* pag. 627. *Lab.* col. 1301.

(*y*) *Bin.* pag. 627. col. 20. F.

(*z*) *Lab.* col. 1305.

cadius, wherein firſt *Innocent* excommunicates *Arcadius*, and *Eudoxia* the Empreſs, for their injuſtice to St. *Chryſoſtom* (*a*). And then the Emperor writes firſt one ſubmiſſive Letter (*b*) to deſire him to abſolve them, to which the Pope conſents (*c*); yet after all this, *Arcadius* doth again write another Letter to excuſe himſelf and tells the Pope, *Eudoxia* was very ſick upon the grief for her fault (*d*): And all theſe Letters are ſaid to be writ after St. *Chryſoſtom* was dead. But that which diſcovers the cheat is, that all the ancient Hiſtorians do with one conſent agree that *Eudoxia* the Empreſs was dead three years before St. *Chryſoſtom*, which is atteſted by *Socrates*, *Sozomen* and *Marcellinus* (*e*); and the ſame is affirmed by learned Modern Authors (*f*). The firſt who affirmed the contrary was *Georgius Alexandrinus*, a fabulus Writer, who lived above 300 years after this time, and he was followed by *Nicephorus*, *Glycas* and *Gennadius* (*g*), which are all the Authorities *Baronius* can produce for theſe Forged Epiſtles; only he countenances them, true or falſe, becauſe this is an inſtance of a Pope who excommunicated an Emperor, and ſerves them for a good proof that the Roman Biſhop is above the greateſt Princes: But *Labbè* ſpoils the Argument by noting the Margen, that *Eudoxia* died before St. *Chryſoſtom* (*h*), and ſo theſe Letters are notorious Forgeries. Before I leave this matter I muſt obſerve that *Baronius* his great deſign was to repreſent Pope *Innocent* as the chief, yea and almoſt ſole Inſtrument in vindicating the injuries done to St. *Chryſoſtom*, and therefore he tells us, *That* Innocent *would not communicate with the Biſhops of the* Eaſt, *unleſs they would put his name into the Tables*; and he cites *Theodoret* to prove this; but *Theodoret*'s very words are, *That the weſtern Biſhops would not communicate with them, but on that condition**. So when the Adverſaries of St. *Chryſoſtom* (hearing that complaints of their proceedings were made among others to the Pope) ſent ſome to give an account of what they had done, *Baronius* (without any proof) dreams of a ſentence paſſed by *Innocent* to null what they

(*a*) *Innoc.* ep. 30. *Bin.* pag. 628. *Lab.* col. 1308.

(*b*) *Bin.* ib *Lab.* col. 1309.

(*c*) *Lab.* ſolus ibid.

(*d*) *Lab.* col. 1313. *Baron. An.* 407. pag. 259.

(*e*) *Socrat.* lib. 6. cap. 19, 20. 21. *Sozom.* lib. 8. cap. 27, 28. *Marcell.* Chron. pag. 13.

(*f*) Vid. Ap. Coci cenſuram. pag. 113.

(*g*) *Baron. An.* 404. pag. 220.

(*h*) *Lab.* marg. col. 1308.

* *Baron. An.* 407. pag. 258.

they had done (*i*); whereas it appears the ſame year, that Pope *Innocent* writ very friendly to *Theophilus* the chief Agent in *Chryſoſtom*'s condemnation, and held communion with him long after that unjuſt Fact (*k*); ſo that there is no reaſon to brag of this Pope, as being the Judge and Patron of that glorious Confeſſor (*l*). who alas, died in his exile, and (excepting good wiſhes) had no benefit by the Popes kindneſs: Yea, he was ſo far from being Judge, that he referred this Cauſe of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s to the Judgment of a Synod (*m*), as *Baronius* himſelf afterwards declares: So *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* alſo never did ſubmit the Cauſe to *Innocent* as *Baronius* pretends (*n*), nor did he take him for the ſupreme Judge in it; but after all, retained his obſtinacy to his death: So that if we do allow Pope *Innocent* to be right in his Judgment, yet he either had little power or ſmall courage to ſerve this great and good Man; and what he did for him was in conjunction with other Biſhops, not by his ſingle Authority. *Innocent*'s 31*ſt.* Epiſtle is directed to *Theophilus* (St. *Chryſoſtom*'s mortal Enemy) the Patriach of *Alexandria*, wherein the Pope calls him Brother, and ſaith he held Communion both with him and with *Chryſoſtom* alſo, and wiſhes him to refer the Cauſe to a Synod, and there let it be tried according to the *Nicene* Canons (*o*). Now *Baronius* from hence notes, that the Communion of the Roman Church was highly valued, and that all were to hold Communion with thoſe who were in Communion with *Rome*, and therefore they were to ſtick to the Communion of *Chryſoſtom* (*p*): But the very words of the Epiſtle confute this Gloſs; for ſuch as followed the Popes example at that time, were to communicate both with *Chryſoſtom* and *Theophilus:* And I muſt obſerve that *Innocent*'s adviſing *Theophilus* to come to a Synod and let this Cauſe be tried there according to the *Nicene* Canons; this (I ſay) ſhews, That the Pope did not then pretend to find any thing in the *Nicene* Canons, for referring Cauſes by appeal to *Rome*; but his two next Succeſſors (as ſhall be ſhewed preſently) forged ſuch

(*i*) Idem. An. 404. pag. 207.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 196.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 406. pag. 144.

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 404. pag. 196.

(*n*) Id. ibid. pag. 192.

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 628. *Lab.* col. 1311.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 404. p. 196. ut ſupr.

ſuch Canons ſoon after, and pretended they were made at *Nice*. After this follows a reſcript of *Honorius*, pretended to be writ to his Brother *Arcadius* (*q*); wherein that Emperor ſaith, Chryſoſtom's *was a cauſe concerning the Biſhops, which ought to have been determined in a General Council, and when either Party had ſent Legates to the Biſhop of* Rome *and thoſe of* Italy, *a final Sentence was to be expected from the Authority of them all:* But the Editors have forged a Title to this Letter, wherein they ſay, *Epiſcopal Cauſes are to be tried by a Council of Biſhops, and to be examined and determined by the Popes Authority:* Where we ſee the forged Title expreſly contradicts the Letter it ſelf; for that refers theſe Cauſes to a Council in the *Eaſt* with the conſent of all the Biſhops of *Italy* as well as the Pope; but this Title is deſigned to perſuade us, that the Popes Authority was finally to determine all matters of this kind. The 32*th* 33*th* and 34*th* Epiſtles of *Innocent* have nothing in them worth noting, and if they be genuine, their mean Style and many Incongruities are no credit to the Author (*r*).

(*q*) *Bin.* pag. 628. *Lab.* col. 1311.

(*r*) *Bin.* pag. 629. *Lab.* col. 1315.

After theſe Epiſtles *Labbè* publiſhes certain Canons ſent from *Rome* to the Gallican Church, by ſome Pope or other; and becauſe by *Sirmondus* his gueſs, it was *Innocent*, they are placed here (*s*); there is nothing remarkable in them, but the zeal of the Collector of theſe Canons to perſuade the *French* to follow the peculiar Cuſtoms of *Rome*.

(*s*) *Lab.* col. 1316, ad 1322.

§. 3. The Councils which the Editors place next, and with the Title of *Councils under* Innocent, were called indeed in his time, but neither by his Authority, nor ſo much as by his Advice: The firſt Council of *Milevis*, ſaid to be *under Innocent*, was (as the Notes confeſs) held under the Primacy of *Xantippus* (*t*), and was held ſo ſoon after *Anaſtaſius* his death, that probably theſe African Fathers had not yet heard of *Innocent*'s Election, nor do the Acts of it mention any Pope: The Council at the Oak, wherein *Chryſoſtom* was depoſed, was called by, and held under *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*,

An. Dom. 402.

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 630. *Lab.* col. 1323.

An. Dom. 403.

dria, wherein they proceeded to deprive an Eminent Patriarch without the knowledge or conſent of the Pope; and had not the Articles been falſe and the Sentence unjuſt, it had never been revoked barely for wanting *Innocent*'s approbation (*u*). *Labbè* prints the Acts of this Synod which *Binius* had omitted (*w*). About this time were frequent Synods held in *Africa*; the Years and Order of which being uncertain, the Editors have placed the Acts of them altogether (*x*); and here we have only ſome Notes with the bare Titles: On which we will make ſome few remarks: Firſt, they are all here ſaid to be held *under Innocent*, but the Acts themſelves intitle them to be held in ſuch a year of the Emperor. Secondly, The Notes on the Firſt African Council tell us of Legates *ſent to the Pope for obtaining ſome indulgence to the Donatiſts*; *which Legates being returned, they related in this Council, what they had obtained from* Anaſtaſius (*y*). Now this would make any one, who doth not conſult the Acts themſelves (printed on purpoſe in Pages far off) to think, the Pope was ſolely concerned in this matter, which is an invention of *Baronius* (*z*). But if we look back into the former Council, we ſhall find theſe African Legates were ſent in general *to the parts beyond the Seas, and to* Venerius *Biſhop of* Milan *as well as to* Anaſtaſius *Biſhop of* Rome (*a*). And *Baronius* himſelf in the year when theſe Legates were firſt ſent, ſaith, *they were to go firſt to* Rome, *and alſo to other tranſmarine Biſhops* (*b*); and again, *Letters being ſent to* Anaſtaſius *and other Biſhops of* Italy (*c*). Now the African Fathers applying to all theſe Biſhops as well as to the Pope, declares they did not look on him as ſufficient alone to determine their Matters: Beſides, they did not ſend to theſe Weſtern Biſhops *to obtain indulgence* (as the Notes out of *Baronius* falſly pretend); For they had decreed before to indulge them, only deſired the Weſtern Biſhops for the more credit, to give their Suffrages to this Fact; for ſo it would appear not to be only their ſingle Opinion. The Second African Council was not *under Innocent*, as the Title pretends (*d*), but under *Aurelius*,

(*u*) *Bin.* pag. 631.
(*w*) *Lab.* col. 1354.
(*x*) *Bin.* pag. 744. *Lab.* col. 1104.
(*y*) *Bin.* pag. 631. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1332.
(*z*) *Baron.* An. 403. pag. 181. & An. 405. pag. 234.
(*a*) *Bin.* pag. 745. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 1081, &c.
(*b*) *Baron. An.* 401. pag. 129.
(*c*) Ibid. pag. 130.
An. Dom. 404.
(*d*) *Bin.* pag. 631. *Lab.* col. 1332.

lius, as may be ſeen by the Acts; and after the meſſage from the Italian Biſhops, added to their own Authority, would not work on the obſtinacy of the Donatiſts, they decree to ſend Legates to the Emperor *Honorius* to deſire him to ſuppreſs them, ordering theſe Legates to carry Letters of Communion to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and other Biſhops of thoſe parts, and to receive other Letters of Communion from them in *Italy* to teſtifie they were Catholicks: But a little after the Notes, turn this into receiving Letters of Communion only from the Pope (*e*), and infer from thence, that none were Catholicks but ſuch as were in Communion with the Biſhop of *Rome*: Whereas they ſhould have added, *and with other Biſhops of thoſe parts*; and then it had appeared, that this was no peculiar priviledge of any one See, but related to all Sees which then were filled with Catholick Biſhops. I ſhall note only, that in theſe Notes the Emperor is ſtiled *The Lord of the General Council* (*f*), which Title the Roman Paraſites of late have robbed him of, and given it to the Popes.

An. Dom. 407.

(*e*) Concil. *Afric.* 4. *Bin.* pag 632. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1233.

(*f*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* ibid.

The eighth Council of *Africa* petitions the Emperor *Honorius* to revoke that Edict, whereby he had granted liberty of Conſcience to the Donatiſts; and the Notes out of *Baronius* make it ſo meritorious a thing to revoke this ſcandalous and miſchievous Indulgence, that this made *Honorius* ſo bleſſed as to have *Rome* quitted by *Alaricus* three days after he had taken it (*g*); but our Engliſh Romaniſts, when an Indulgence ſerved their ends, counted it meritorious in that Prince who granted the Sects ſuch an Indulgence here, for we muſt note that Things are good or evil juſt as they ſerve their intereſt, or diſſerve it.

An. Dom. 410.

(*g*) *Bin.* pag. 633. *Lab.* col. 1335.

The Synod of *Ptolemais* in *Egypt* (*h*), whereby *Andronicus*, a Tyrannical Officer, was excommunicated; is ſtrangely magnified by *Baronius*, ſaying, that *Syneſius* Biſhop of *Ptolemais*, *knew that when he was made a Biſhop, he was elected by God to give Laws to Princes*: And a little after he tells us, *He depoſed* Andronicus *from his Tribunal*; adding, *that this ſhews how great the Power of Biſhops was,*

An. Dom. 411.

(*h*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* ibid.

even to the deposing of evil Governors (*i*). But after all, there is no more of this true, but only that *Synesius* gives notice to his neighbour Churches by circular Letters that he had excommunicated *Andronicus*, who seems to have been a Military Officer in a little Egyptian Town, and was guilty of most horrid Cruelties and notorious Crimes (*k*): But what is this to Kings and Princes? And the words which he cites out of *Synesius* 89*th* Epistle, which falsly translates, *we have put him down from his Tribunal*, are these, Ἡμεῖς τε οὖν ἐνταῦθα συγνῶ βήματος αὐτὸν ἐξειλόμεθα, &c. *We have here taken him off from the Seat of Mourners*; that is, *Synesius* tells *Theophilus* his Patriarch and Superior, that though he had justly put *Andronicus* among the Penitents, yet now upon his sorrow and repentance, they had there absolved him and taken him out of that sad station where the Penitents were wont to stand; and if *Theophilus* approved of this mercy shewed *Andronicus*, he should hope God might yet forgive him (*l*). Now was not the Cardinal hard put to it for an instance of a Bishops deposing a King, when he is forced to falsifie his Author, and use the words which express a restauration to the Communion of the Church, to prove a deposing from a Throne? It seems he could not or would not distinguish a Captain or petty Magistrate from a King; nor a Stool of Repentance from a Princes Throne: This it is to serve a Cause.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 311. pag. 328, 329.

(*k*) *Synes.* ep. 57, 58.

(*l*) Vid. *Causab.* pref. ad exerc. in *Baron.* & lege ep. 89. *Synes.* ap. *Baron.* ibid. pag. 329.

About this time was held that famous Conference at *Carthage* between the Catholicks and the Donatists. Seven Bishops of each side being chosen to dispute before *Marcellinus* a Count sent by the Emperor to hear this Cause (*m*). Now *Baronius* tells us that this *Marcellinus was not called simply a Judge*, but had the Title of *Cognitor*, because it was not allowed to a *Lay-man* to act as a Judge in Ecclesiastical Matters (*n*). But *Cognitor* is often used by the best Authors for a Judge, and *cognoscere Causam*, is, *to hear a Cause*; *Dies Cognitionis*, is, *the day of Tryal*: And which is more, the Emperors Edict calls him by the title of *Judex*; *Our will is, you shall sit in*

(*m*) *Bin.* a pag. 634, ad 698. *Lab.* à col. 1336, ad 1506.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 411. pag 318.

in that Diſputation in the principal place, as Judge (*o*); and *Baronius* in the very page before cites St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaking of *Marcellinus* by this Character, *ipſe Judex* (*p*). And as he moderated in the Diſputation, ſo in the Concluſion he pronounces the Sentence, and the Emperor confirms it (*q*); which if the Pope had done in Perſon, or by his Legate, to be ſure that had been ground enough to prove him the Univerſal and Infallible Judge in all Cauſes. This is certain, *Honorius* did judge in this Cauſe by his Legate *Marcellinus*, and *Baronius* (who uſe to quarrel at other Emperors for medling in theſe Caſes) tells us God rewarded him for the pains he took about ſetling the True Religion (*r*). But as to the Pope he was not concerned in this Famous Diſpute; and which is very remarkable, though the Main Diſpute be about the Catholick Church, and the Orthodox alledge the Churches beyond the Seas as being in Communion with them, and ſo prove them Catholicks; yet they do not once name the Roman Church apart, as if communicating with that Church or its Biſhop were any ſpecial evidence of their being Catholicks: Indeed they name *Innocent* once, but give him no other title but Biſhop of *Rome*: Whereas if theſe African Fathers had believed the Pope to be the Supream Head of the Catholick Church, and that all of his Communion, and only ſuch were Catholicks, this Diſpute had been ſoon ended, and they had nothing to prove to the Donatiſts, but their Communion with Pope *Innocent*. And I remember *Baronius* argues that *Cæcilianus*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, was a Catholick, becauſe he had Communicatory Letters from the Church of *Rome*; but the place he cites to prove it out of St. *Auguſtine* is this, *When he* (that is, *Cæcilianus*) *ſaw himſelf in Communion with the Roman Church, (in which the eminence of an Apoſtolical See always flouriſhed) and with other Countries from whence the Goſpel came to* Africa, *&c.* (*s*). By which it is plain, that it was Communion with other Churches as well as *Rome* which proved *Cæcilianus* a Catholick: And I know not where *Baronius* found another paſſage, which he

(*o*) Inter *Geſta Bin.* pag. 647. *Lab.* col. 1346.
(*p*) *Baron.* ut ſupr. pag. 317, & pag. 322.
(*q*) *Bin.* pag. 698. & *Lab.* col. 1506.
(*r*) *Baron. An.* 411. pag. 322.
(*s*) *Aug.* ep. 162. ap. *Baron. An.* 412. pag. 336.

he affirms was proved in this Conference, *viz. That the firſt Head of the Church was demonſtrated by the ſucceſſion of the Roman Biſhops to be in* Peter's *Chair* (*t*) : For there is not one word to this purpoſe in that Conference which is printed by the Editors here : So that till better Authority be produced, this muſt ſtand for a deviſable of the Annaliſts.

(*t*) *Baron. An.* 411. pag. 320.

An. Dom. 415. Nothing after this occurs which is remarkable, till the Council at *Lidda* or *Dioſpolis* in *Paleſtina*, wherein *Pelagius* impoſed upon fourteen Biſhops a pretended recantation of his Heretical Opinions, and was by them abſolved (*u*). *Binius* his Title of this Synod is, *that it was under* Innocent: But *Labbè* (fearing this might imply the Popes conſent to a Hereticks abſolution) hath ſtruck that out. However we have *Baronius* his word for it, that no Letters were written to the Pope from this Synod (*w*), only ſome Lay-men brought him the Acts of it. And he, Good Man (not ſo cunning at finding out Hereticks as the African Biſhops) confeſſes *he could neither approve nor blame the Judgment of theſe Biſhops of* Paleſtina (*x*). And *Pelagius* himſelf, though he could not finally deceive the Roman Church, yet he hoped he might gain the Pope to his party, and did attempt it; yea 'tis very probable he had ſucceeded, if St. *Auguſtin* and other African Fathers had not inſtructed the Pope, and made him underſtand the danger of this Hereſie: And (we have noted before) that *Innocent*'s carriage in this matter rendred him ſuſpected to be a favourer of *Pelagius* (*y*); upon which the Africans (not truſting to his Infallibility) writ very plainly to him : And after they had condemned *Pelagius* and *Celeſtius* in a Council of thirty ſeven Biſhops at *Carthage*, they writ another briſk Synodical Epiſtle to the Pope, telling him, *that they intimated to him what they had done, that the Authority of the Apoſtolical Seat might be added to their Decree, becauſe his Eminent Place gave more weight to his Doctrine ; and if he thought* Pelagius *was juſtly abſolved, yet his Errors and Impieties ought to be Anathematized by the Authority of the*

(*u*) *Bin.* pag. 701. *Lab.* col. 1529.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 416. pag. 388.

(*x*) Vid. *Innoc.* ep. 26. & *Bin.* not. p. 702. *Lab.* col. 1532.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 416. pag. 388.

the Apoſtolical See (z). Now the reaſon of this Letter, was not ſo much for the confirmation of their Acts (as the Notes pretend) upon any ſingle Priviledge believed to be in the Pope, as their Supream Head; becauſe they call him by the Title of *their* Brother, both in the Title and the Letter; but becauſe the Pelagians had reported he was their Friend, and a favourer of their Opinions; which Report did very much miſchief becauſe of the Eminence of his See, and therefore it concerned both the Pope for his own vindication, and them alſo, that he ſhould wipe off this accuſation: And it appears both by St. *Auguſtine* and *Proſper*, that at laſt *Innocent* did condemn this Hereſie; but this Synodical Epiſtle from *Carthage*, dated *An.* 416. ſhews that he had not condemned it before the laſt year of his life; for he died (according to *Baronius*) in *July An.* 417. So hard a thing was it for the African Fathers to get a pretended Infallible Judge to underſtand and cenſure a notorious Hereſie. I might now leave this Head, but that I muſt firſt obſerve the confidence of *Baronius*, who from one word in a verſe of *Proſper*'s, will needs have *Celeſtius* a Diſciple of *Pelagius*, *to have been firſt condemned at* Rome, *after the antient manner, that a new Hereſie ſhould be firſt Examined and Condemned by the firſt Seat* (a). But when he ſhould make this out, he owns that *Pelagius* and *Celeſtius* indeed were firſt condemned in *Africa*, but he tells us their Hereſies were condemned long before at *Rome* in the perſon of *Jovinian*: But if it were true that *Jovinian* had held all the Hereſies of *Pelagius* (which is moſt falſe) then we muſt attribute no great ſagacity to *Innocent* as to condemning Hereſies, becauſe 'tis plain he did not know theſe were the ſame Hereſies that *Jovinian* had held, nor could he be brought to cenſure them, till above four year after.

(z) Concil. *Carthag. Bin.* pag. 702, &c. *Lab.* col. 1533.

(a) *Baron. An.* 412. pag. 340.

The Second Council of *Milevis* conſiſted of ſixty Biſhops, the Title is, *under Pope* Innocent (b). But *Baronius* had told us before, *that the ſame* Aurelius, *Biſhop of* Carthage, *preſided in the former Council of* Milevis, *and*

An. Dom. 416.

(b) *Bin.* pag. 704. *Lab.* col. 1537.

in

(c) Baron. An. 402. pag. 164.

(d) Bin. pag. 705. Lab. col. 1543.

(e) Not. Bin. pag. 710. Lab. col. 1554.

(f) Bin. pag. 752. Lab. col. 1112.

(g) Bin. pag. 705. Lab. col. 1542.

in this alſo (c); ſo that neither of them were under any Pope: The 22*d* Canon of this Council ſaith, *that he who thinks to appeal to a Tribunal beyond the Sea, ſhall not be received into Communion by any in* Africa (*d*): Which is a clear prohibition of appeals to *Rome*; and therefore *Gratian* either found or made this notorious addition to it, *unleſs they appeal to the See of* Rome (*e*), which is ſo groſs a Forgery that *Binius* rejects it, and out of *Bellarmin* expounds this paſſage only, of prohibiting the inferiour Clergy, Prieſts and Deacons, *&c.* to appeal beyond the Seas, *i. e.* to *Rome*; but he ſuppoſes that Biſhops in *Africk* ſtill had liberty of appealing thither according to the 17*th* Canon of *Sardica*: But to confute this falſe Gloſs, let it be noted, That theſe African Fathers profeſs in a following Council, that they had never heard of any ſuch Canon, or of this Sardican Synod, and ſo it is not likely they ſhould be guided by it: Again, about ten years before upon a complaint to *Innocent* of ſome Biſhops, who being cenſured in *Africa*, ran to *Rome* with Complaints, this very Pope had written, *that Biſhops ſhould not lightly go to the Parts beyond the Seas*: And the Council in *Africk* confirmed that paſſage of the Popes Letter (*f*). And ſince this would not reſtrain ſome Biſhops here in this ſecond *Milevitan* Council, they make a Decree, *That Biſhops Cauſes ſhould be determined by Biſhops, either ſuch as the Primate (of* Africk*) ſhould appoint, or ſuch as the Parties choſe by his conſent* (*g*): And then they add this 22*d* Canon to confine all appeals of the inferior Clergy alſo to an African Synod, or to their own Primate; and then add this Clauſe recited before, *that thoſe who appeal beyond the Seas, ſhall not be received to Communion by any in* Africa: which certainly is the penalty relating to both Canons; becauſe in their Letter a few years after written to Pope *Celeſtine*, they declare *it is contrary to the* Nicene *Canons for the Pope to receive any into Communion by Appeal, who have been cenſured in their own Province, eſpecially Biſhops*, adding, *That his Holineſs ſhould (as became him)* alſo *forbid the wicked refuges of Prieſts and the lower*

lower Clergy, &c. That is, not only the Appeals of Biſhops, but of Prieſts alſo (*b*), which makes it as clear as the Sun, that theſe Fathers at *Milevis* abſolutely forbad all Appeals to *Rome*. And they had great reaſon ſo to do, not only becauſe it was their right to judge finally all Cauſes in their own Province: But becauſe ſome Popes about this time had encouraged Hereticks and notorious wicked Men, both Prieſts and Biſhops who had fled from the juſt Cenſures of their own Church, and found a Sanctuary and Shelter at *Rome*: But of this more hereafter. This ſecond Council of *Milevis* writ alſo to Pope *Innocent* about the Pelagian Hereſie, to quicken him in providing ſome Remedies to prevent the ſpreading of that Infection, ſuppoſing the eminency of his place would add much weight to his Cenſures, if he would heartily appear againſt theſe Doctrines (*i*). At the ſame time *Aurelius* and St. *Auguſtin* with three other eminent Biſhops there, writ a private Letter to *their* Lord and Brother (as they call him) *Pope Innocent*, on the ſame ſubject (*k*); in which they deal very plainly with him, and give the reaſon why they writ ſo many Letters to him againſt this Hereſie, *becauſe they had heard that in* Rome (where the Heretick lived long) *there were many who favoured him on divers grounds; ſome, becauſe they ſay that you have been perſuaded ſuch things were true; but more becauſe they do not think he holds thoſe Opinions.* And doubtleſs it was this Report which rouzed up the Pope at laſt to condemn the Pelagians, as may appear by our Notes upon his 26*th* Epiſtle, which is in Anſwer to this Epiſtle of the five Biſhops: But that Anſwer, as alſo the Anſwers to the two Councils Letters were not till *January An.* 417. as *Baronius* and *Binius* themſelves compute (*l*), which was but ſix Months before *Innocent*'s death; ſo long did this Pope remain under the ſuſpicion of being a favourer of Pelagianiſm.

(*b*) Epiſt. ad *Celeſt.* ap *Bin.* pag. 757. *Lab.* col. 1675.

(*i*) *Bin.* pag. 706. *Lab.* col. 1546.

(*k*) *Bin.* pag. 707. *Lab.* col. 1546.

(*l*) *Bin.* pag. 703. in not. ad Concil. *Carthag. Lab.* col. 1536.

An. Dom. 417. §. 4. *Zoſimus* ſucceeded *Innocent* in his Chair, and in his partial affection for the Pelagians; his life as it is writ in the Pontifical, hath nothing in it that is remarkable (*m*), for his time was very ſhort, but one Year, two Months and eleven Days according to the Pontifical, or One Year, four Months and ſeven Days as *Binius* in his Notes; though *Labbè* correct both him and *Baronius*, and ſays it was nine Months and nine Days above a year that he ſat; and he follows *Proſper* (who then lived) in this Account, and therefore it is the moſt certain. As to his Acts, *Baronius* prepares his Reader for his entrance, by telling us out of the Pontifical and *Gennadius*, *That* Innocent *made a Decree for the Univerſal Church againſt the Pelagians*; *and* Zoſimus *afterward promulged it* (*n*). But we ſhall ſee preſently that he was very ſlow in publiſhing any Cenſures againſt theſe Hereticks: For though both *Baronius* and *Binius* would colour over the matter, yet *Labbè* very honeſtly confeſſeth, *that Pope* Zoſimus *was deceived by the Craft of* Celeſtius, and he proves it out of St. *Auguſtin* (*o*); and *Marius Mercator* a Writer of that very time (whoſe admonition is printed in *Labbè*) owns that *Zoſimus* was impoſed on by this Heretick, till the African Fathers had better informed him in theſe matters (*p*); ſo that the Church was rarely well provided of an Infallible Head in the mean time, who was only zealous to affect his Primacy, but had not ſenſe enough to judge of Hereſie till he was informed of it from better Divines.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 710. *Lab.* col. 1554.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 417. pag. 396.

(*o*) *Lab.* not. col. 1560.

(*p*) *Lab.* col. 1513. ſcil. in *Marij Merc.* commonitorio. Vide item not. *Sirmond.* in Ap. *Lab.* col. 1815.

This Pope is ſaid to have writ thirteen Epiſtles; The firſt by the want of a good Style and the barrenneſs of the Matter, may probably enough be genuine (*q*), having nothing worthy of note in it, except ſome impertinent brags of the Authority of his See. The ſecond Epiſtle is a declaration of ſome of the Roman Clergy excommunicated, who had fled to *Ravenna* to complain of the Pope (*r*). *Baronius* and the Notes meerly gueſs theſe to be favourers of *Pelagius*; but it ſeems more probable

(*q*) *Bin.* pag. 711. *Lab.* col. 1556.

(*r*) *Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* col. 1557.

probable that they were Catholicks who disliked the Popes proceedings while he favoured *Celestius*, which it is certain he did, till the year 418. was well advanced (in which this Epistle is dated,) for he writ his fourth Epistle for those Hereticks, the 11*th* of the Kalends of *October* (*s*), doubtless in the year after his third Epistle, which is dated *An.* 417. As to that third Epistle, *Zosimus* declares, that upon a solemn and judicial examination of *Celestius* (the Scholar of *Pelagius*) he found him clear of the Heresies with which he was charged in *Africa*, and cites his Accusers to come to *Rome* within two Months, or he should be intirely restored to Communion (*t*). At the same rate he talks in the fourth Epistle, pleading the Cause of both *Pelagius* and *Celestius*, declaring them innocent, and representing *Heros* and *Lazarus* (two holy Bishops of *France*) as ill Men and false Accusers; railing at *Timasius* and *Jacobus*, who had been converted from this Heresie by St. *Augustin*, as meer Calumniators, boasting all along that the Cause was by appeal referred to him, and magnifying the Authority of his Apostolical Seat (*u*). With this Epistle also he sent into *Africa Pelagius* his Confession of Faith, which *Zosimus* took to be very Orthodox, and doubted not but the African Fathers would think his Faith to be unblameable; whereas in that whole Confession, there is not one clear acknowledgment of the absolute necessity of God's Grace, or of the necessity of Infant Baptism to wash away Original Sin, which were the Main Errors that *Pelagius* was charged with (*w*): So that we see a Pope, an Infallible Judge, either out of Ignorance or evil Principles, deceived both in Matters of Faith and of Fact, mistaking Heresie for Truth, condemning the Innocent and Orthodox, and absolving the most notorious Hereticks. Now let us enquire how *Baronius* and *Binius* bring him off: They say first, that *Zosimus could not, if he would reject this Confession of Faith*, because *they said, if they had erred, they desired* Zosimus *to correct whatever he thought to be wrong* (*x*): And *that they were ready in all things of*

(*s*) *Bin.* pag. 714. *Lab.* col. 1560.

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 712. *Lab.* col. 1558.

(*u*) *Bin.* pag. 713. *Lab.* col. 1561.

(*w*) *Bin.* pag. 714. *Lab.* col. 1563.

(*x*) Notis ad ep. 3.

Faith to believe as the Pope believed (*y*). Now this is no manner of Excuſe, but rather an Aggravation, that after ſo fair an offer the Pope did not rectifie their Errors; this ſhews either that he did not underſtand the Queſtion, or that he was as much a Heretick as they, eſpecially ſince he not only paſſed over their Errors, but commends them and pleads their Cauſe: Yea, *Baronius* himſelf ſaith, *this Confeſſion contained a manifeſt Error, and had things in it far from the Catholick Faith* (*z*); yet ſtill the Pope could not or would not ſee theſe Errors in matters of Faith; ſo that here was a manifeſt failure in their pretended Infallibility, at a time when there was great need of it, to condemn a dangerous Hereſie, which the Pope was ſo unacquainted with, that in his Third Epiſtle he calls theſe Diſputes *Enſnaring Queſtions, and Fooliſh Contentions, which rather deſtroyed than edified:* I further add, *that in* Pelagius *his Confeſſion of Faith, which he pretended to be the Faith of the Roman Church; the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid only to proceed from the Father,* the *Filioque* is not added; and though the Popes of later times have condemned that omiſſion as Hereſie in the Greeks, *Zoſimus* here paſſes by that alſo, and takes all for ſound Doctrine.

(*y*) Not. ad ep. 4. *Baron. An.* 417. pag. 405, 406, &c.

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 418. pag. 410.

Secondly, As to matter of Fact, *Oroſius* and the African Fathers, believed *Heros* and *Lazarus* to be holy Biſhops, and Orthodox Men; and *Proſper* (who might know them perſonally) teſtifies as much of *Heros* (*a*): But *Baronius* and *Binius* ſay *Celeſtius* had belied them to *Zoſimus*, and ſo excuſe the Pope from blame: But if *Celeſtius* did raiſe theſe Scandals, *Zoſimus* made them his own by believing and publiſhing them; and he who took upon him ſo much Authority as to judge a Cauſe, ſhould not have eſpouſed one of the Parties ſo far, as to take all they ſaid of their Adverſaries to be true: Yet thus this Pope dealt with *Timaſius* and *Jacobus* alſo. Like to this was his Judgment about *Patroclus* Biſhop of *Arles*, and the Priviledges of that See; For (as *Proſper* informs us) *Heros, an holy Man, Scholar of St.* Martin, *though free from all Crimes, was expelled*

(*a*) Not. *Bin.* ad ep. 3.

pelled out of his Biſhoprick by the People, and Patroclus *put in his place* (*b*), whom *Baronius* calls *an Uſurper* (*c*): And when afterward he was ſlain, he ſaith, *it was God's juſt judgment upon him to avenge his wickedneſs, who had invaded a worthy Mans See, and alſo diſturbed the rights of his Neighbour Biſhops* (*d*). But *Zoſimus* in his fifth Epiſtle, makes him the Primate of all thoſe parts of *France*, on pretence that *Trophimus* was ſent from *Rome*, and was the firſt Biſhop there, and that it was his ancient right; and allows none to come from thence to *Rome* without Letters dimiſſory from this *Patroclus* (*e*). And in the *6th*, *7th*, *8th* and *9th* Epiſtles, he ſtill advances this ill Man, condemning *Proculus* Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, and all others who oppoſed *Patroclus* in his moſt unjuſt uſurpations and encroachments: Yet *Binius* in his Notes confeſſeth, that both his next Succeſſors, *Boniface* and *Celeſtine* did judge otherwiſe (*f*); that is, they took away this Primacy from *Patroclus*, and cenſured him for his evil doings, giving the Priviledges to *Hilary* Biſhop of *Narbon*, to whom of right they belonged (*g*): So that here is Pope againſt Pope, and Decretal againſt Decretal; ſo odly do Cauſes go at *Rome*: But by *Zoſimus* his *11th* and *12th* Epiſtles it doth appear, that the French Biſhops deſpiſed the Popes Decrees, and that *Proculus* went on in exerciſing his Primacy for all his being prohibited (*h*), which looks not favourably on the Roman Supremacy. As ill fortune had Pope *Zoſimus* (who was always on the wrong ſide) in admitting the Appeal of *Apiarius*, an African Prieſt, who was excommunicated by *Urban* his own Biſhop for moſt horrid Crimes, which he afterwards confeſſed in an open Council (as we ſhall ſhortly ſhew;) yet *Zoſimus* thinking it for the honour of his See to have Appeals made to it from Foreign Parts, admits this wicked Wretch to Communion, commands the African Synod to receive him, and threatens *Urban* with an excommunication if he did not retract his Sentence: But the African Fathers for all this went on to judge *Apiarius*, as will be ſeen afterwards; for *Zoſimus* died before this Cauſe was ended.

(*c*) *Baron. An.* 412. pag. 345.
(*b*) ibid. *An.* 422. pag. 475.
(*d*) Id. *An.* 426. pag. 500.
(*e*) *Bin.* pag. 715. *Lab.* col. 1567.
(*f*) Notis ad ep. 5.
(*g*) *Bonif.* ep. 3. pag. 721.
(*h*) *Bin.* pag. 717. *Lab.* col. 1573.

I have

An. Dom. 418. I have deferred the conſideration of *Zoſimus* his 10*th* Epiſtle to the laſt place, becauſe it was the laſt he writ (that is now extant) in the Cauſe of *Celeſtius*, and becauſe it was writ to the Council of *Carthage* now aſſembled: For the Pope after he had admitted Hereticks and evil Men to appeal to *Rome*, was reſolved to juſtifie the Fact, and ſent two Biſhops, *Fauſtinus* and *Potentinus*, and two Prieſts, *Philip* and *Aſellus*, his Legates into *Africa*, with falſe Copies of the *Nicene* Canons to prove he ought to be appealed to in all Cauſes from all Provinces; and probably by them (or ſome little time before) he ſent this Tenth Epiſtle (*i*), wherein he brags, *that Tradition and the Canons had given ſuch great Authority to the Apoſtolical Seat, that none might preſume to queſtion its Decrees*; with a great deal of ſuch ſtuff about *Chriſt's giving* Peter *the power to bind and looſe, and the Canons giving this to his Succeſſor, who was to have the care of all Churches*; *and that ſince he held this place, none might examine a Cauſe which he had determined*, &c. Yet out of reſpect to the Africans (he ſaith) *he had done nothing in the Cauſe of* Celeſtius, *till they had deliberated about it, and that this Cauſe was juſt in the ſame State as it lately was.* I relate this more at large, becauſe this unjuſt and ambitious Claim was the occaſion of a famous Controverſie that laſted many years after the death of *Zoſimus*: But as to the Letter, the impertinency of it is very obvious; for though he aſſume this Authority, it is plain, that St. *Cyprian* of old, and the African Fathers afterward, did not think it any preſumption to confute the Decrees of Popes, and to examine Cauſes which had been ill judged at *Rome*. And in the Cauſe of *Celeſtius*, whom *Zoſimus* would not yet be induced to condemn; the Council of *Carthage* (as *Proſper* relates) tell the Pope, *That they had reſolved to confirm Pope* Innocent's *Sentence againſt him, till he did openly confeſs the neceſſity of Grace* (*k*): And they went on with the judgment againſt *Apiarius*, for all his Appeal to *Rome*, and his being abſolved there; ſo that it is impudently done of the Roman Writers to go about to prove the Supremacy

(*i*) *Bin.* pag. 717. *Lab.* col. 1572.

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 418. pag. 409.

macy from a Popes evidence in his own Cauſe; yea, from a Claim which was denied and deſpiſed at the ſame time that it was made. Another note I make on this Epiſtle is, that it is dated but the 12*th* of the Kal. of *April*, and *Zoſimus* died in *January* following; ſo that it is plain, that he had not condemned *Pelagius* and *Celeſtius* nine Months before he died. And though by thoſe paſſages which *Labbè* hath publiſhed out of St. *Auguſtine* and *Proſper* (*l*), it be certain he did cenſure this Hereſie at laſt; yet it could not be long before his death, and therefore *Zoſimus* was a manifeſt favourer of Hereticks, almoſt all the time he was Pope; and he may thank the African Fathers for his Repentance; who (though they were abuſed and injured by him) hide as much as may be all his ill deeds in favour of *Celeſtius*, and for the credit of *Zoſimus* and the Catholick Cauſe, only publiſh his lateſt Acts, after he was by them convinced that Pelagianiſm was an Hereſie: But *Celeſtius* and his party openly exclaimed againſt *Zoſimus* for a Turncoat (*m*).

(*l*) *Lab.* col. 1575.

(*m*) Vid. *Opt.* in *Voſſ.* Hiſt. *Pelag.* lib. 1. c. 2. 8.

The ſame year was that Council in *Africa*, which the Editors intitle *under Zoſimus* (*n*), but really was againſt him: For without regarding his ſuſpending the Cauſe of *Celeſtius*, they particularly condemned all the points of the Pelagian Hereſie by Anathema's, and order all Cauſes between Biſhops to be tried in the Province where they ariſe, and renew the Canon of *Milevis*; that the Prieſts and inferior Clergy ſhould be tried by their own Biſhops; and whoever ſhould appeal to the parts beyond the Seas, ſhould not be received *into Communion by any in* Africa (*o*): So that we ſee the African Church perſiſted in maintaining their Rights, and condemning Appeals, as they had very good reaſon, conſidering the bold attempt of *Zoſimus*, to uſurp a juriſdiction over them; and his erroneous judging ſuch Cauſes both of Faith and Manners as he had preſumed to meddle in; which hapning in other Provinces, he broke the Canons of the ancient Councils, by pretending to examine and decide them elſewhere;

(*n*) *Bin.* p. 718. *Lab.* col. 1576.

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 754. *Lab.* col. 1131.

where; forgetting that which *Gratian* had collected out of his own ſeventh Epiſtle, and gives us here for *Zoſimus* his Decree (*p*), viz. *That the Authority of the Roman See it ſelf cannot make any new Order, nor alter old ones againſt the Statutes of the Fathers:* So *Gratian* reads it, and ſo *Æneas Sylvius* cites it (*q*); ſo alſo the Editors publiſh it here; but ſome forging hand in the ſeventh Epiſtle hath put *concedere* inſtead of *condere*, for fear this Sentence ſhould take away from the Pope the power of making New Canons contrary to the Fathers Decrees; a Priviledge, of which *Rome* hath made more uſe than any Church in the World. This Pope's time is concluded with a forged African Council at *Telepte*, wherein it is pretended they only read the fourth Epiſtle of *Siricius*, and thence the Notes and *Baronius* gather *that the African Church ſhewed great reſpect to the See of* Rome (*r*). But firſt *Labbè* confeſſed before, that this Epiſtle of *Siricius* was forged (*s*): And Secondly the Story is ill timed; for the African Church had never leſs reaſon to reſpect the Popes than now, when they ſo manifeſtly robbed them both of their Rights and their Peace alſo: Wherefore it is not probable that a Council ſhould meet there at this time, only to read an Epiſtle which was invented long after.

(*p*) *Bin.* pag. 718. *Lab.* col. 1574.

(*q*) De geſt. Concil. *Baſ.* *Faſcic.* rer. expet. Tom. 1. pag. 12.

(*r*) *Bin.* pag. 719. *Lab.* col. 1577.

(*s*) *Lab.* col. 1029.

An. Dom. 419. §. 5. Upon the Death of *Zoſimus*, there were two Popes choſen, *Boniface* and *Eulalius*, and the Pontifical fairly tells us, the Clergy were divided for ſeven Months and fifteen days, and that both of them acted as Popes. This Schiſm being notified to the Emperor by *Symmachus*, the Prefect of the City, he cites both the Pretenders to *Ravenna*, and appoints divers Biſhops to examine into the Cauſe; but they not being able to agree whether had the better Title, the Emperor defers the buſineſs till the Kalends of *May*, and forbids both Parties to enter into *Rome*, till a Council had met at *Rome* to determine this Controverſie. But *Eulalius* (who before ſtood fairer of the two) impatient of this delay, contrary to the Emperors Command,

on

on the fifteenth of the Kalends of *April* goes into the City, and cauſes great Factions there: Upon which 250 Biſhops met by the Emperors Order, execute his Commands, and declare *Eulalius* to be no Pope, ſetting up *Boniface* (*s*). Upon which paſſage I ſhall obſerve, Firſt, That the Notes make but a vacancy of two days between *Zoſimus* and *Boniface*; and *Baronius* ſaith it was not vacant above one day (*t*). Whereas it is plain from the Emperors Letters, dated three or four Months after, that neither of them was reckoned to be Pope; and he writes to the African Biſhops, that he would have the Council meet by the Ides of *June*, that the Papacy might be no longer void (*u*); ſo that in truth the See was vacant till the Emperor had judged it on *Boniface* his ſide. *Baronius* doth not like it ſhould be ſaid that the Emperor had any right to interpoſe in the Election of a Pope; but *Symmachus*, the Præfect of *Rome*, ſaith expreſly to *Honorius*, *it is your part to give judgment in this Matter* (*w*); and the Emperor did at firſt by his ſingle Authority declare *Eulalius* to be rightly choſen (*x*): But upon better information he revokes that Reſcript, and *Commands that neither Party ſhould have any advantage by what was paſt, but all ſhould be reſerved intirely to his judgment* (*y*): And though he employed a Synod of Biſhops to examine the Matter, yet it appears in *Baronius*, that the Emperors Edict was that which gave the Papacy to *Boniface* (*z*): Which will appear more plainly by the firſt Epiſtle of *Boniface*, and *Honorius* his Anſwer to it.

(*s*) Vita *Bonif.* & not vid. *Bin.* pag. 719, 720. *Lab.* col. 1580, & 1581.

(*t*) *Baron. An.* 418. pag. 429.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 419. pag 435.

(*w*) Idem *An.* 418. pag. 430.

(*x*) Ibid. *An.* 419. initio.

(*y*) Ibid. pag. 433.

(*z*) Vid. ibid. pag. 438, 439.

For after this Pope was in peaceable poſſeſſion, fearing the like miſchief after his death, which had happened at his entrance, he writes an humble Supplication to the Emperor to take care of this matter for the future: And the Emperor writes back to *Boniface*, declaring, *That if ever two ſhould contend about the Papacy, and be Ordained, neither of them ſhould be Pope, but he who by a new Election ſhould be taken out of the Clergy by the Emperors judgment, and the Peoples conſent* (*a*). This writing of the Popes among the Councils, hath

(*a*) Epiſt. & Reſcript. vid. ap. *Bin.* pag. 720, 721. *Lab.* col. 1582, 1583.

this Title, *The Supplication of Pope* Boniface: But *Baronius* thinking that too mean, fraudulently leaves out the Title (*b*); though the Humility of the Style ſufficiently ſhews that the Pope believed that the Emperor was above him; and whereas *Boniface* there calls the Church *Our Mother*, as the Margin in *Binius* rightly reads it (*c*). *Baronius* will have it to be *your Mother*; and *Labbè* leaves out the Marginal and true Reading (*d*); for it ſeems they think it below the Pope (though not the Emperor) to be *a Son of the Church.* If the ſecond Epiſtle of *Boniface* be genuine, it ſhews that when Complaints were made to *Rome* out of the near adjoining Provinces, the Popes (even after they had given too much encouragement to Appeals) were wont to refer the matters complained of, to be examined and decided by the Biſhops of thoſe Provinces where the Fact was done (*e*). But the Notes conclude from hence, *that the accuſation of Biſhops uſe to be referred to the Pope* *; which is an univerſal Concluſion from Premiſes that will not bear it. The third Epiſtle of *Boniface* contradicts all thoſe which were writ before by *Zoſimus*, in favour of *Patroclus*, Biſhop of *Arles*; for *Boniface* forbids *Patroclus* to exerciſe the Power granted him by the laſt Pope, and decrees that *Hilary*, Biſhop of *Narbon* ſhall be Metropolitan †; and if he judged right, then *Zoſimus* judged wrong in this Cauſe. For this Pope the Editors publiſh ſix Decrees, one of which orders the differences among Biſhops to be decided by the Metropolitan; or however by the Primate of that Country; from whoſe determination there was to be no Appeal (*f*). The fourth Decree is certainly ſpurious, becauſe it not only forbids a Biſhop to be brought before any Judge Civil or Military for any Crime, but declares the Magiſtrate who preſumes to do this, ſhall loſe his Girdle, that is, be put out of his Office. Now doubtleſs it was not in the Popes power to give or take away Civil or Military Offices: So that this hath been invented meerly by thoſe who affected the Popes being ſupreme over Kings and Emperors, and would have the Clergy exempt

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 419. pag. 440.

(*c*) Marg. *Bin.* p. 720. col. 2.

(*d*) *Lab.* col. 1582.

(*e*) *Bin.* pag. 721. *Lab.* col. 1584.

* Vid. *Baron. An.* 419. pag. 460.

† *Bin.* ut ſupr. *Lab.* col. 1584.

(*f*) Decret. *Bonif.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 722. *Lab.* col. 1587.

empt from all Secular Juriſdiction. As to the Pelagian Controverſie, he writ nothing about it himſelf; but we are told by *Proſper, that* Boniface *deſired St.* Auguſtine *to anſwer the Books of the Pelagians* (*g*), and he ſhewed his Wiſdom in putting the Cauſe into a better hand than his own.

(*g*) *Proſp.* adv. Collat. c. 41.

We muſt now return to the buſineſs of the Legates ſent into *Africa* by Pope *Zoſimus*, a little before his death, who appeared in the ſixth Council at *Carthage*, not till the time of this Pope *Boniface*, in order to juſtifie the Roman Churches Right to receive Appeals from all Churches. The Title indeed falſly ſaith this Council was held *about the manner of proſecuting Appeals* (*h*); but it is plain that the African Fathers queſtioned *the right of appealing, and had condemned before, all Appeals to any Church beyond the Seas.* In this Council the Popes Legates produce a Canon, which they ſay was made at *Nice*, importing, *That if a Biſhop were condemned in his own Country, and appealed to* Rome, *the Pope might write to the neighbouring Biſhops to enquire again into the matter, and decide it; but if all this did not ſatisfie the Complainant, the Pope might either ſend his Legates, with his Authority to judge it there with the Biſhops, or leave it finally to thoſe of that Country as he pleaſed* (*i*). Now this Canon was no ſooner read, but *Alypius*, one of the African Biſhops, declared he could not find any ſuch Canon in the Greek Copies of the *Nicene* Council, and deſired *Aurelius*, who preſided in the Council (though the Popes Legates were there) to ſend to the three other moſt famous Patriarchal Churches of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, to ſearch their Copies of the *Nicene* Council; and that the Pope might be deſired to ſend ſome thither alſo at the ſame time; which motion was ſo fair, and ſo certain a way to find out the truth, that the Legates yielded to it, as they did alſo to have another Canon examined, whether it were in the *Nicene* Council or no, about the Appeals of the lower Clergy: After which they reſolve to annex a genuine Tranſcript of the *Nicene* Creed and Canons, to

(*h*) *Bin.* pag. 722. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1589.

(*i*) Extat Græco Lat. ap. *Bin.* p. 727. Lat. extat ap. *Lab.* col. 1590.

the Acts of their Synod, which concluded with a Letter to *Boniface*; which the Editors had no mind to publiſh in this place, but give it us elſewhere (*i*). The Sum of it is, they tell their honourable Brother, that hearing he was in *Zoſimus* place, they had writ to him about *Apiarius*, who had now confeſſed his Faults before them, and begged pardon, and was removed from officiating in his old Church, but allowed to keep his Degree. Then for the two Canons pretended to be made at *Nice*, they ſay, they had inſerted them in their Acts till the true Copies of the *Nicene* Council came; but if they were not found there, they would not be compelled to endure ſuch things as they had no mind to mention, nor to ſuffer ſuch intollerable burdens; but they hoped while he was Pope, they ſhould not be uſed with ſuch Inſolence or Pride, but that they ſhould be dealt with by brotherly Charity; adding, that they had ſent a Copy of their Acts by two of his Legates, who might make them known to his Holineſs. This is the true, though brief account of this Famous Council, wherein the Roman Church was diſcovered to aim at Superiority, and a uſurped Juriſdiction, and to practiſe it to the prejudice of the Faith, and the Rights of other Churches. Moreover, it was here diſcovered, that *Rome*, to cover this injuſtice and irregularity, had corrupted the Canons of the moſt famous of all Geneneral Councils, and cited ſuch Canons out of it, as never were made there. And now to wipe off this ſcandal, *Binius* and *Baronius* ſtickle vehemently, and try all their Art to get St. *Peter*'s Ship off from theſe Rocks. The former publiſhes long Notes (*k*); the latter falls from writing Hiſtory to diſpute (*l*): But all in vain; for *Binius* after he hath falſly told us, *that it was the Antient Cuſtom for Biſhops and Prieſts to appeal to* Rome, *and for the Africans to deſire their Sentences to be confirmed by the Pope*; Confeſſes, that the Popes Legates cited the Canons of *Sardica* under the name of thoſe of *Nice*, and that they were not to be found in the Originals of the Council of *Nice*, kept in the other Patriarchal Sees:

(*i*) *Bin.* pag. 755. *Lab.* col. 1670.

(*k*) *Bin.* pag. 729. *Lab.* col. 1599.

(*l*) *Baren. An.* 419, pag. 447, ad 456.

Sees: But then he pretends the African Biſhops did not (as we do) charge *Zoſimus* with fraud and forgery. I anſwer, that how modeſtly ſoever they might ſpeak of this Fact, it really was a notorius Impoſture, and it was ſufficient that they proved it to be ſo, and writ plainly to both *Boniface* and *Celeſtine* (as the Letters yet extant ſhew) that they would never endure that uſurped Power any more, which the Popes by virtue of theſe feigned Canons had exerciſed: And if rejecting Appeals to *Rome* be making a Schiſm, 'tis certain the Africans did not ſuffer them ſo long as the face of a Church remained there; ſo that probably that Epiſtle of *Boniface* the ſecond, writ to *Eulalius* near an hundred years after, may be true, and had not been cenſured by *Baronius* and *Binius*, but only becauſe it ſuppoſes a Church might have Martyrs in it and be a true Church, though it utterly diſowned all ſubordination to *Rome*: And I am ſure they juſtifie many Epiſtles that are leſs probable, if they make for the intereſt of the Pope. Againſt this, *Baronius* and the Notes Object, that there was an Appeal made by an African Biſhop of *Fuſſala*, who for notorious Crimes was put out of his See by St. *Auguſtine* and others; and it ſeems *Boniface* and *Celeſtine* both allowed this Appeal, and heard his Cauſe; and this, theſe Flatterers of *Rome* think hapned at this time by the Providence of God (*m*). But let it be conſidered, that for ſo notorious a Criminal as this Biſhop to appeal at this time, is neither any credit to the Pope, nor any proof that there were no African Canons at this time to prohibit it; for it is likely enough, that an ill Man, who had no means to ſhelter himſelf from the Juſtice of his own Country, but by appealing to thoſe Popes, who at that time pretended a Right to receive ſuch Complaints, would uſe that means of Appeal, even though it were condemned in *Africa*. So that his appealing doth not prove it was lawful, nor that it was not forbid there: Beſides, though St. *Auguſtine* writ modeſtly, yet he intimates no more, but that ſome ſuch Sentences as he had

(*m*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* not. ut ſupr. *Baron. An.* 419. p. 451.

had paſſed on this Biſhop of *Fuſſala*, had been paſſed or approved by the Popes; which only prove in Fact, that ſome African Biſhops had before this time appealed, but he doth not ſay it was right; yea, we ſee the Councils, in which he was preſent, condemning it as an uſurpation and great injuſtice, *ex malis moribus bonæ Leges.* The thing had been practiſed till the Popes foſtering Hereticks, and lewd convicted Criminals opened the Eyes of the African Church, and made them prohibit them, and claim their antient Rights. Again, upon St. *Auguſtine*'s Letter it appears, the Pope did not proceed to reſtore this Biſhop; and it ſeems when former Popes had taken upon them to reſtore ejected Biſhops, they were forced to do it by ſtrong hand, even by ſending Clerks with Soldiers to execute the Sentence, which ſhews their Authority was not ſubmitted to in *Africa*: And the Biſhops in their Letter to *Celeſtine*, boldly charge him never to ſend any ſuch again; for if they ſhould ſubmit to ſuch proceedings, they ſhould be guilty of bringing Secular Violence into the Church of God. The Notes go on to charge us Proteſtants for ignorantly and treacherouſly inſulting over *Zoſimus*, as one that attempted to ſteal a Power to receive Appeals from *Africa*. Whereas the African Biſhops themſelves prove the Fact: And in the ſecond Part I have produced a very antient Scholi-

(*n*) Rom. Forg. par. 2. An. 347. pag. 111.

on (*n*), which expreſly cenſures theſe Popes for Impoſture as well as Uſurpation; and I now add, that *Zonaras* above 400 year before the Reformation ſaith in his Notes upon the Sardican Council, *That the Biſhops of Old* Rome, *from this Canon, boaſted a right to Appeals from Biſhops in all Cauſes, and falſly ſaid it was made in the firſt Council of* Nice; *which being propounded in the Council of* Carthage, *was found not to be true, as the Preface to that Council ſhews. So that neither was this Canon made at* Nice, *nor doth it decree that Appeals ſhall be made to him from all Biſhops, but only from thoſe who were ſubject to him, which at that time were almoſt all thoſe of the* Weſt, *that is*, Macedon, Theſſaly, Illiricum, Greece, Pelo-

Peloponeſus *and* Epirus, *which afterwards were ſubjected to the Church of* Conſtantinople; *ſo that Appeals from thence were to be made to that Patriarch for the future* (*o*). Where-fore we are not the firſt, who charged the Popes with Uſurpation and Impoſture both in this Caſe: But the flattering Notes go on and tell us, that if the Controverſy had been about the Right of Appeals, and not about the manner of appealing, the Popes Legates would have cited the *4th* and *5th* Canons of *Sardica*, which treat of the Right of Appeals, and not the *7th* which treats only of the manner of proſecuting them: Now this is an open Falſhood; for the firſt Canon the Legates cite is in the beſt Edition of the Sardican Canons, the fifth, and is about the Right of Biſhops to appeal (*p*). And the ſecond they cite is the *14th* Canon, and it is about the Appeals of Prieſts and Deacons (*q*); ſo that neither of the Canons cited is about the manner of proſecuting Appeals; and the latter which the Notes call the *7th* Canon of *Sardica* doth not mention *Rome*.

(*o*) *Zon.* Schol. 5 Can. Concil. Sardic. *Bever.* Tom. 1. pag 489.

(*p*) *Bin.* Tom. 1. pag. 426. *Bever.* Tom. 1. pag. 488.

(*q*) *Bin.* pag. 429. *Bever* pag. 501.

They proceed to tell us there were 217 Biſhops firſt and laſt ſubſcribed to this Council, being a great Provincial Council, which ſhews how unanimous the Africans were in condemning the Popes Uſurpation: As to the Popes Legates, the Notes grant they did not preſide there; and truly it was not fit they ſhould, when their own Cauſe was to be examined, and *Rome* was the criminal Church here to be tried. Again, The Note (*k*) impudently calls the fifth Canon of *Sardica* by the name of the ſeventh Canon, and pretends the Africans did not like the latter way of proſecuting Appeals; That is, by the Popes ſending Legates into *Africk* to hear theſe Cauſes, but allowed him to delegate them upon an Appeal to rehear the Appellant: Whereas the Council doth expreſly reject the whole Canon as a Forgery, and forbid all Appeals to the parts beyond the Seas, ſo that this is only defending one Lie by another, and cleanſing a Blot with blotted fingers.

The

The next Note (*l*) gravely tells us, that the words *Sardican Council*, were falſly put into the Text of this Council, becauſe the Legates profeſſed theſe Canons were made at *Nice*, and becauſe the African Fathers ſay they knew of no Sardican Council, which had allowed of the Popes ſending Legates, &c. (*r*) Now all this pains might have been ſpared; for theſe words (Sardican Council) are only in a corrupt Latin Edition, but the Greek and Latin Copy which is the beſt, hath no ſuch words at all. But we may note here very juſtly, That theſe Popes were ſtrangely inſolent to cite two Canons of a poor obſcure Council, never heard of in *Africa*, no not by the learned S. *Auſtin* (as the Notes confeſs,) and daringly fix theſe Canons upon the moſt famous general Council that ever was, eſpecially ſince the Nicene Council doth expreſly charge (*s*), That every Biſhops ſentence ſhall ſtand good in his own Province; ſo that he who is Excommunicated by ſome ſhall not be received by others. Now the pretended Canon allows the Pope to receive any perſon Excommunicated by the Biſhops of his own Province: So that it expreſly contradicts the Canons of the Nicene Council; and yet the Popes confidently ſaid it was made there: Had the African Fathers believed them and ſubmitted, no doubt theſe two Canons, and perhaps all the reſt of that petty Synod had been impoſed upon the World for genuin Canons of the Nicene Council, by the Roman Church, whoſe Emiſſaries have forged no leſs than 60 new Canons, and publiſhed them under the name of that famous Council. Before I leave this ſubject, I muſt note, that *Baronius* and *Binius* who here confeſs theſe two Canons were made at *Sardica*, do in the Notes on the Nicene Council, impudently cite them, to prove there were more than twenty Canons made at *Nice*, of which number they ſay were the Canons about Appeals, produced in the ſixth Council of *Carthage* (*t*). *Baronius* hath one trick more, For he *ſaith the Council of* Sardica *was a General Council, as well as that at* Nice, *and of as great Authority, and ſo it was all*

(*r*) Not. in Concil. 6. Carthag. *Bin.* pag. 730. Col. 2 *F. Lab.* col. 1602.

(*s*) Concil. *Nicen.* can. 5. vid. *Bin.* pag. 725.

(*t*) *Bin.* notis ad Concil. *Nicen.* ſupr. pag. 296.

all one, which Council the Popes cited (*u*). I have diſproved this before, and only note here, that if the African Fathers had believed this, doubtleſs they would not have put themſelves to ſo great coſt and trouble, to ſend to three foreign and remote Churches to ſearch out the Truth: I muſt add, that the Biſhops aſſembled at *Carthage*, thought the Nicene Canons ſo conſiderable, that they annex a Copy of them to their Acts, wherein this is remarkable, That the ſixth Canon is cited without that forged Preface, which the Roman Writers of late would make a part of the Canon it ſelf, viz. *The Roman Church hath always had the Primacy.* No ſuch words appear in this African Copy (*w*); wherefore we may conclude, they have been invented ſince by ſome of the Popes Creatures.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 419. pag. 448. & 454.

(*w*) *Bin.* pag. 725. *Lab.* col. 1595.

§. 6. *Celeſtine* ſucceeded *Boniface*, yet ſo as the Notes confeſs the Faction of *Eulalius* would not communicate with him: However, he ſeems to have been very Orthodox as to the Pelagian Controverſy, though *Laurentius Valla* truly cenſures him for one of no great Learning; the Style of his Epiſtles ſhewing he was no accurate Latiniſt; and in his own Epiſtle to *Neſtorius*, yet extant in the Epheſine Council, he confeſſes he underſtood no Greek (*x*): So that whatever he did againſt *Pelagius* or *Neſtorius*, was done at the requeſt and by the direction of Men more learned than himſelf: However it was well, that this Pope was ſo willing to aſſiſt S. *Cyril* againſt *Neſtorius*, and *Proſper*, with others, againſt the *Pelagians*; for his See being eminent, his appearing on the Orthodox ſide gave great countenance to their Cauſe, and promoted the Condemnation of thoſe Hereticks, which the Notes and *Baronius* ſo extremely magnify (*y*) as if he was the firſt who condemned them; and that it was ſolely his Authority which ſuppreſſed them, the falſhood of which we ſhall ſhew preſently. The Pontifical ſaith, *He ordered the Pſalms to be ſung by way of Antiphon by all, before the Sacrifice*: But if he firſt brought in this

An. Dom. 423.

(*x*) Concil. Epheſ. Epiſt. *Celeſt.* ad *Neſt.* *Bin.* pag. 135. *Lab.* col. 353.

(*y*) Vita *Celeſt.* *Bin.* pag. 732. *Lab.* col. 1610.

kind of ſinging them at *Rome*, we are ſure they had been ſung ſo long before, both in the *Eaſt* and at *Milan*; and it ſeems it is no diſparagement for the holy Roman See to follow other Churches.

The firſt Epiſtle of *Celeſtine*, hath a great many Sections added to it in *Binius*, which are a Collection made by *Proſper*, or ſome Eminent Writer againſt the *Pelagians* (*z*). But *Labbè* prints the Epiſtle by it ſelf, and then prints the Collections apart: However it is thought *Celeſtine* approved them, and ſo they are cited by divers Ancients under his name (*a*): But if we compare the Matter or the Style of thoſe Additions with the former part, which is *Celeſtine*'s genuin work, it will eaſily be diſcovered, that the Popes Authority was far more conſiderable than his Learning: And if any Man wonder why this Collector is ſo careful, to ſet down the Decrees of the Roman Church againſt this Hereſy (*b*), the reaſon is plainly expreſſed, *viz.* That ſome ſecret Favourers of *Pelagius*, (conſidering the kindneſs he and his followers had found at *Rome*) profeſſed they would ſtand by the Decrees of that Church.

(*z*) *Bin.* pag. 733. *Lab.* col. 1611.

(*a*) *Voſſij* Hiſt. Pel. cap. 30. pag. 82.

(*b*) *Bin.* ibid. §. 3. *Lab.* col. 1614.

His ſecond Epiſtle hath nothing memorable in it, but that the Pope thinks the affairs of the Province of *Narbon*, to be *things far remote* (*c*); which ſhews they had not then uſually intermedled with the concerns of all the Churches in the World. A little after he ſaith, *we of the Clergy ought to be diſtinguiſhed from the Laity, by our Doctrin, not by our Garments; by our Converſation, not by our Habit; by our purity of Mind, not our Dreſs*: Which looks as if he would abrogate wholly the diſtinct Habits of the Clergy, and perſuade them and the Laity to go alike: Which groſs notion the Notes labour to cover as well as they can, by pretending he forbids only new Faſhions of Habit to the Clergy: But if it were ſo, this would reflect upon the various Habits of every ſeveral Order of Monks. And yet if we look well upon the Text, he poſitively diſlikes all Habits which may diſtinguiſh the Clergy from the

(*c*) *Bin.* pag. 735. *Lab.* col. 1619.

the Laity, which now adays Proteſtants account a Fanatical Opinion.

Moſt of the following Epiſtles are printed in the Council of *Epheſus*, and ſhall there be conſidered: It ſuffices to obſerve here, That the 9*th* Epiſtle to the Emperor *Theodoſius* (*d*) owns that *Arcadius* and *Proje-ctus* were to repreſent his Perſon in the Council of *Epheſus*, which the Emperor had Commanded to be held: Therefore *Cyril* did not repreſent Pope *Celeſtine*; and not the Pope, but the Emperor called that Council.

(*d*) *Bin.* pag. 737 *Lab.* col. 1623.

The 10*th* Epiſtle affirms, *that the care which Kings take in the matters of Religion is not ineffectual* (*e*); which ſhews, that *Baronius* had no reaſon to be ſo ſevere upon all thoſe Princes who medled with Religious Affairs. Out of the 12*th* Epiſtle to *Theodoſius* we may note, that *Atticus* late Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* is ſaid to be *of moſt reverend Memory, and a moſt couragious defender of the Catholick Faith* (*f*): And in *Celeſtine*'s Epiſtle to *Neſtorius*, Atticus *of bleſſed memory, a Teacher of the Catholick Faith* (*g*). But this very Biſhop had a long conteſt with the Biſhops of *Rome*, and was Excommunicated by Pope *Innocent* (*h*); and he on the otherſide valued this ſo little, that he Excommunicated thoſe who were in Communion with *Rome*; and calls *Paulinus* and *Evagrius* and their adherents (among which was the Pope) by no gentler a name than that of *Schiſmaticks* (*i*). So that how Orthodox ſo-ever he might be in any other things, 'tis plain, he did not believe the Roman Church Infallible, nor think it was neceſſary to be in Communion with it: And though he erred (as they now believe at *Rome*) in ſo main a Point; yet while he was at open Enmity with the Pope, *Baronius* tells us he wrought a Miracle (*k*); ſo that a Man would think, Miracles are no proof of the true Church: Another paſſage in this Epiſtle is Memorable, *viz.* That *Celeſtine* ſaith, *Neſtorius* was *Excommunicated by the general ſentence of the Biſhops:* Which the Reader muſt remember, when the flattering Notes any where ſay, *the*

(*e*) *Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* col. 1624.

(*f*) *Bin.* pag. 739. *Lab.* col. 1629.

(*g*) *Bin.* Concil. Epheſ. pag. 134.

(*h*) *Baron. An.* 406. pag. 244.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 412. pag. 348.

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 408. pag. 272.

Sentence againſt this Heretick was ſolely the Act of Celeſtine. And indeed *Baronius* having recited his 11*th*, 12*th*, 13*th* and 14*th* Epiſtles, boaſts of him, as if God had raiſed him up to ſtand in the gap againſt thoſe Hereticks which then infeſted the Church, and gives him all the Glory of the Victory over them (*l*). Whereas, if *Proſper* and *Cyril* had writ no better againſt *Pelagius* and *Neſtorius* than *Celeſtine*, it is to be feared that theſe Hereſies had not been cenſured in that Age. Yet in the main he was a good Pope, and had the fortune to take the right ſide in theſe Controverſies, and therefore is highly commended by divers of the Orthodox; and he is very free in returning the Complements: For in his laſt Epiſtle he calls *Cyril an Apoſtolical Man* (*m*); and *Maximianus* of *Conſtantinople* he ſtyles *his Colleague*. And this may ſuffice for this Popes Epiſtles.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 432. pag. 616.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 741. *Lab.* col. 1633.

We are entertained next with another Collection of African Councils, held, as they ſay, under Pope *Boniface* and *Celeſtine* (*n*); but the Titles mention no Pope at all; nor were they called by any Pope, but by the Biſhop of *Carthage*, who preſided in them, even when the Popes Legates were preſent: We have taken notice of moſt of theſe before, and therefore ſhall paſs them over very briefly. In one of them they reſolve to ſend a Legate to their *holy Brethren and fellow Biſhops*, Anaſtaſius *of* Rome, *and* Venerius *of* Milan, putting them ſo equally into the Scale, that the Pope is only firſt named (*o*). A little after *Aurelius*, Biſhop of *Carthage* ſaith, *That he by God's appointment ſuſtained the care of all the Churches:* The Margin tells us he means *in Africa* (*p*); but I muſt note, that if a Pope had ſaid ſo in this Age, though he could mean no more than the Churches of the Suburbicarian Regions, theſe Gentlemen would have ſtretched that to all the World. Another Council in the twelfth Conſulſhip of *Honorius*, and the eighth of *Theodoſius*, had a Canon in ſome ancient Copy, wherein theſe Fathers *Anathematize them that hold any middle place between Heaven and Hell, to which*

(*n*) *Bin.* pag. 744. *Lab.* col. 1641.

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 745. *Lab.* col. 1643.

(*p*) *Bin.* pag. 747. *Lab.* col. 1647.

which unbaptized Infants go; and they expreſly declare, that whoever is deprived of the Right Hand, muſt fall into the Left; and that no Catholick doubts but he is with the Devil who is not a Coheir with Chriſt (*q*). Now this looks ſo foul upon *Limbus Infantum* and Purgatory, the later Inventions of *Rome*, that their Paraſites have left this Canon out in other Copies of this Council (*r*): And here it is printed in a different Character, as if it were no genuine piece of the Council, only becauſe it condemns the modern Opinion of the Roman Church; but the impartial Reader will conclude, that the Ancient Copy of this Canon was elder than either *Purgatory* or *Limbus Infantum*.

(*q*) *Bin.* pag. 753. *Lab.* col. 1664.

(*r*) Vid. *Bin.* pag. 786.

Here alſo the Editors print at large the two famous Epiſtles of the African Biſhops, to two Popes ſucceſſively, *Boniface* and *Celeſtine*, wherein they do utterly condemn Appeals to *Rome*, and diſcover the forgery of thoſe pretended Nicene Canons, by which their Legates attempted to juſtifie them. I have given an account of the former of theſe Letters in the Life of *Boniface*. And I ſhall add here, that the latter Epiſtle to their honourable Brother *Celeſtine* (writ ſome years after) ſhews the Africans continued ſtill in the ſame mind (*s*); for therein they acquaint him that they had called a Council; *and though* Apiarius *alledged the Priviledge of the Roman Church which had received him unlawfully to Communion, they examined his Cauſe, and at laſt he confeſſed his notorious Crimes: Wherefore they earneſtly deſire the Pope not ſo eaſily to receive Complaints from thence, nor admit thoſe to his Communion whom they had excommunicated; for they ſhew that the Nicene Council forbids this, both as to Biſhops, Presbyters and Lay-men, without any derogation to the priviledge of the African Church, committing all the Clergy to their own Metropolitan, and wiſely ordering every buſineſs to be determined in that Province where it aroſe, knowing that the Spirit of God would not be wanting to any Country, where a Council of Biſhops ſhould meet; ſo that none need fear to be injured, ſince*

(*s*) *Bin.* pag. 757. *Lab.* col. 1674.

ſince they might appeal to a greater Council of their own Province, or to a Univerſal Synod: Whereas if Judgment were to be given beyond the Seas, many Witneſſes muſt be wanting, and many other things muſt hinder the finding out of truth. They add,—*That they could not find any Council which allowed his Holineſs to ſend any Legates to hear Cauſes; and for thoſe Canons which* Fauſtinus *had produced, as made at* Nice, *they could find no ſuch Canons in the Authentick Copies of that Council. Finally, They bid him not ſend any of his Clerks to execute his Sentence, to which if they ſhould ſubmit, they ſhould ſeem to bring the vanity of Secular Arrogance into God's Church.* This is the Sum of this excellent Letter, which diſowns and condemns all Appeals, and renounces the Popes juriſdiction over *Africa*, with a modeſt intimation, that his claim was grounded upon a notorious Forgery, and therefore he is required to pretend to it no longer, for that they will not ſubmit to ſuch an Uſurpation. Yet ſuch is the Impudence of the Roman Editors, that in a Marginal Note upon this Epiſtle (*t*), they ſay theſe African Biſhops deſire the Pope, *to appoint another way of proſecuting Appeals:* Which is a groſs contradicting the Text it ſelf, wherein all manner of Appeals, and all ways of proſecuting them are utterly condemned; but this was too harſh, and therefore the Truth was to be daubed over with this plauſible Fiction.

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 757. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1675.

After this *Binius* preſents us with another Edition of theſe African Canons and Epiſtles, in Latin and Greek (*u*). And *Labbè* newly publiſhes the Epiſtle of one *Leporius*, who had been converted from Hereſie, and reconciled to the Church by the African Biſhops (*w*), by which we may learn, that a Heretick need not go to *Rome* to recant, as the Notes formerly affirmed. There is nothing further obſervable before the Council of *Epheſus*, except two Councils, one at *Rome*, wherein the Pope is ſaid to make *Cyril* his Legate in the Cauſe of *Neſtorius*; the other at *Alexandria*, in which *Cyril* is pretended to Act by this delegated power (*x*).

(*u*) *Bin.* pag. 758.

(*w*) *Lab.* col. 1678.

(*x*) *Bin.* pag. 794. &c. *Lab.* col. 1688.

But

But this will be more properly conſidered in the Hiſtory of that General Council, where theſe Epiſtles are printed at large.

CHAP. II.

Of the time from the Council of Epheſus *till the Council of* Chalcedon.

§. 1. IN this Year was held the Third General Council at *Epheſus*, upon the account of *Neſtorius*, who about three years before had been made Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and was at firſt believed to be both Pious and Orthodox; but he had not ſat long in that See, before he began to publiſh certain Doctrines about our Saviour, which gave great offence; for he taught that Jeſus Chriſt was two Perſons, one as the Son of God, another as the Son of Man; and therefore he denied the Bleſſed Virgin to be the Mother of God, holding that the Perſon which was born of her, was no more than a Meer Man: Which Opinions, not only made a Faction at *Conſtantinople*, but cauſed Diviſions among the Egyptian Monks; whereupon St. *Cyril* firſt writ a Confutation of them to thoſe Monks, and then with great modeſty admoniſhed *Neſtorius* of theſe Errors, by divers Letters; but he deſpiſed his Admonition, juſtified the Doctrines, and perſecuted thoſe who would not own them, being ſupported by his Intereſt in the Imperial Court. Upon this, *Cyril* called in Pope *Celeſtine* to his aſſiſtance, ſending him an account of what he had writ to *Neſtorius*: On the other ſide, *Neſtorius* alſo writ to *Celeſtine*, and ſent *An. Dom.* 431.

ſent his Sermons in which theſe Doctrines were contained, for him to peruſe. The Pope by the advice of ſuch Weſtern Biſhops as he could then get together, takes the part of *Cyril*, and offered him to join with him in condemning *Neſtorius*, if he did not recant: But the Authority of theſe two Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Alexandria*, not ſufficing to condemn a Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, it was thought fit to deſire the Emperor to call a General Council at *Epheſus*, where *Neſtorius* might appear, and his Opinions be examined; and the Emperor at length did agree to this Requeſt. Now that which we are to obſerve concerning this General Council, ſhall be under theſe Heads. *Firſt*, To enquire by whom it was called and convened. *Secondly*, Who preſided in it. *Thirdly*, What is memorable in the Acts of it. *Fourthly*, Who confirmed the Decrees there made.

As to the firſt, the Hiſtorical Preface, before this Council, labours to perſuade us, That *Celeſtine* commanded the Council to be called (*a*); and the Notes after it ſay, *it was appointed by the Authority of* Celeſtine, *and gathered together by the counſel, aid and aſſiſtance of* Theodoſius *the Emperor* (*b*). The Cardinal goes further, and ſaith *Theodoſius called it by the Authority of* Celeſtine (*c*); but when this is to be proved, both the Notes and *Baronius* are content to make out, *that this Council was not called without the Popes conſent*; which may be proved concerning every Orthodox Biſhop that was there; and ſo gives no peculiar advantage to the Biſhop of *Rome*. But as to the Convening it *by his Authority, nothing can be more falſe:* For by the Emperors firſt Letter to *Cyril*, it appears that *ſome then thought to order Matters of Religion by Power, rather than by conſulting in common* (*d*); in which words he reflects upon Pope *Celeſtine* and *Cyril*, who thought, by the Authority of their Private Synods at *Rome* and *Alexandria*, to have condemned *Neſtorius*, who was a Patriarch as well as they; and therefore the Emperor rightly conſidered, that he could not be tried but by a General Council.

(*a*) *Bin.* Tom. 1. par. 2. pag. 2. *Lab.* Tom. 3. col. 4.

(*b*) *Bin.* pag. 477. *Lab.* col. 1241.

(*c*) *Baron. An.* 530. pag. 547, &c.

(*d*) *Bin.* pag. 162, 163. *Lab.* col. 433.

Council: So that it ſeems *Celeſtine*, at firſt, had no mind ſuch a Council ſhould be called, nor *Cyril* neither; but when they ſaw their Authority was inſufficient, then *Cyril* put the Monks of *Conſtantinople* upon petitioning the Emperor *to command a General Council to meet very ſpeedily* (as their words are) (*e*); and the ſame *Cyril* put *Juvenalis*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, upon writing to the Emperor for the ſame purpoſe (*f*). Now why ſhould not theſe Applications have been made to the Pope, if the Council were to be called by his Authority? Beſides, if *Celeſtine* had called it, his Letter of Summons would appear; but though none ever ſaw that, the Emperors Edict is yet extant, wherein he fixes the day and place for the Council to meet, enjoyns *Cyril*, with the Biſhops of his Province, to be there at that time, and tells him he had writ to all other Metropolitans (probably to *Celeſtine* among the reſt) to attend the Synod, and not to meddle with this Matter, till the meeting of this General Aſſembly, from which whoever abſented himſelf, ſhould not be excuſed (*g*). Which is as full a proof that the Emperor called it by his Authority, as is poſſible to be made; and we need add nothing to it but this, that the Synod it ſelf every where declares it was called ἐκ διατάγματος, by the Emperors Decree (*h*), ἐκ νεύματος, by his Will (*i*), *and Summoned by his Letter* (*k*); yea, the Pope himſelf ſaith, *I have obeyed your Pleaſure as far as I was able, and I do appear in the Council which you have commanded, by thoſe I have ſent in my ſtead* (*l*). And when theſe Legates came to *Epheſus*, they ſay, *we are come to the Synod which hath been appointed by the moſt Chriſtian and Gracious Emperors* (*m*). So that it is a ſtrange impudence of *Baronius* and *Binius*, in deſpite of ſo clear evidence, to pretend this Council was convened only by the Advice and Miniſtry of *Theodoſius*, but by the Authority of Pope *Celeſtine*.

(*e*) *Bin.* pag. 162. *Lab.* col. 429.

(*f*) *Bin.* pag. 147, &c. *Lab.* col. 388.

(*g*) *Bin.* pag. 164. *Lab.* col. 436.

(*h*) *Bin.* pag. 168, 210. *Lab.* col. 445--560.

(*i*) *Bin.* pag. 171. *Lab.* col. 452.

(*k*) *Bin.* pag. 211, 212, 214. *Lab.* col. 562, 564, 567.

(*l*) *Bin.* pag. 236. *Lab.* col. 620.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 238. *Lab.* col. 626.

Secondly, The like prevarication they uſe about the Preſident of this General Council, for *Bellarmine* had made it a Maxim, *That in General Councils it was the Popes priviledge to preſide by himſelf or his Legates, and*

to moderate all as Supream Judge (n): Wherefore the Preface to the Council ſaith, Cyril *was to preſide by the command of* Celeſtine, *and the Authority of the Apoſtolick See* (o); and the Notes ſay, *The Pope preſided there by* Cyril, *who had the Office of his Legate* (p): And a little after they produce all the Hiſtorians who writ after *Evagrius* (*An. Dom.* 595.); and becauſe he ſaith *Celeſtine* had given *Cyril* his place, they conclude thence, that he was Preſident of the Council by virtue of that Grant: But indeed the firſt place belonged to *Cyril* as Patriarch of *Alexandria*, in his own Right, becauſe the Biſhop of *Rome* was abſent, and he of *Conſtantinople* was the Criminal to be tried; yet *Celeſtine* had cunningly given him that which was his due without any gift; for in his Letter to him long before the Council was called (when the Synod at *Rome* had condemned *Neſtorius*) *Celeſtine* ſaith, *he might take to him both the Authority of his Throne, and the Order of his Place* (q); which ſignifies no more, than that *Cyril* might vote in *Celeſtine*'s Name, and add the Credit of the Firſt Patriarch to his own Authority, to make the Sentence againſt *Neſtorius* the more Venerable. And the beginning of the Acts diſtinguiſh *Cyril*'s precedency from his holding *Celeſtine*'s place (if they be rightly pointed,) *Cyril*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, preſiding, and [having] the place of *Celeſtine*, &c. And ſo *Zonaras* underſtood it, who ſaith, Cyril *of* Alexandria *preſided, and alſo had the place of* Celeſtine; thus alſo *Balſamon* (s). So that it ſeems *Cyril* was Preſident of the Council, either by choice of the Fathers, or in his own Right, as the Chief Patriach preſent; and he alſo voted in the place of *Celeſtine* who was abſent; and probably by virtue of that Repreſentation alſo, ſate above all the other Patriarchs. However this is certain, that the Biſhop of *Epheſus*, *Memnon*, who had no delegation from the Pope, is alſo reckoned *Preſident of the Synod*; and he, together with St. *Cyril*, are often called ἐξαρχοὶ τῆς σύνοδε, even thrice in one Epiſtle (t). And again, Προέδροι (u); yea, theſe two are called, *the Head of the Council* (w): And all

(n) *Bellar.* de Concil. lib. 1. cap. 19.

(o) Pref. *Bin.* pag. 2. *Lab.* col. 5.

(p) Not. *Bin.* pag. 477. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1243.

(q) Concil. Eph. par. 1. cap. 15. *Bin.* pag. 133. *Lab.* col. 349.

(r) διεπον]Θ, ἀν τὸν τόπον, &c. *Bin.* pag. 168. *Lab.* col. 446.

(s) *Balſam.* & *Zonar.* in 1. Can. Eph. ap. *Bever.* Tom. 1. pag. 99.

(t)) *Bin.* pag. 295, 296. *Lab.* col. 763, &c.

(u) *Bin.* pag. 303. *Lab.* col. 783.

(w) *Bin.* pag. 304. *Lab.* col. 786.

all this without any mention of their having theſe Titles, or this Power from the Pope. Moreover, we may obſerve, that *Cyril* alone is ſometimes called the Preſident of this Council (*x*); and the Party of *John*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, charges him with uſurping this place, which was not given him by the Canons or the Emperor's Edict; (they valued not, it ſeems, the Popes Grant (*y*); ſo that this Title is variouſly applied, and no Argument can be formed from it for the Popes Supremacy; who alſo ſent three other Legates to this Synod, to repreſent his Perſon, and ſupply his Place, as *Celeſtine*'s own Letter declares (*z*): Yea, the Council it ſelf declares, that theſe three Legates, *Arcadius*, *Projectus* and *Philip* did ſupply *Celeſtin*'s place (*a*). Now it is not eaſie to underſtand how *Cyril* ſhould be the Popes Legate and ſupply his Place, and yet at the ſame time three other Legates need to be ſent alſo to ſupply the ſame place, unleſs we expound this Grant of the Popes to *Cyril*, to ſignifie no more than a declaration, that he would agree to all that *Cyril* voted for, which is far from making him a formal Legate, or for giving him that Authority which he had in this Council. We conclude therefore, that *Cyril*, as the firſt Patriarch preſent, and the moſt learned of all that oppoſed *Neſtorius* *, and *Memnon* as Biſhop of *Epheſus*, where the Council was held, were choſen Moderators by the Synod: Nor is it likely that the Popes making theſe his Legates (if that were true, which *Baronius* only ſuppoſes, but doth not prove) (*b*), would have given them any Power over the Council, ſince *Arcadius*, *Projectus* and *Philip*, who really were the Popes Legates, did not preſide, nor are they reckoned up in the firſt place, no not in the Subſcriptions, which yet are not certainly genuine (*c*). And when the Council ſent two of theſe Legates among others on an Embaſſie to *Conſtantinople*, they lay their Commands on them, and threaten, if they do not obſerve their Orders, they would neither confirm their Acts, nor yet receive them into Communion (*d*): Which ſhews the Council was

(*x*) *Leo* Pap. ep. 47. & Concil. Chalced. Act. 4. & in Act. Eph. cap. 60.

(*y*) Act. Concil. *Bin.* p. 274. *Lab.* col. 714.

(*z*) *Bin.* pag. 236. *Lab.* col. 620.

(*a*) *Bin.* p. 154, & 303. *Lab.* col. 666, & 783.

* *Cyril.* —— Cui tunc datur primatus de talibus agendi Liberat. *Brev.* cap. 4.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 430. & *An.* 431.

(*c*) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 566, 568.

(*d*) *Bin.* pag. 302. *Lab.* col. 782.

superior even to the Popes Legates; and that their representing the Popes person, did not intitle them to any Power over the Council, which is that the Roman Parasites would make out. *Richerius* exposes *Baronius* for saying *Philip* had a place before the Bishops, because he was a Cardinal*. The first Seat and Vote therefore belonged to *Cyril*, but Christ (as these Fathers say properly) *was the Head of this General Council* (e), and was represented by the Holy Gospels, placed above all, on a Throne, out of which all decisions were made, not by any Humane Authority, either of *Cyril* or *Celestine* himself.

* Tom. 1. cap. 7. §. 6. p. 287.

(e) Concil. Eph. par. 3. cap. 13. pag. 403. *Bin.*

Thirdly, We shall next examine into the proceedings of this Council, and see where the Editors have prevaricated therein for the interest of *Rome*, as also what else therein is pertinent to our purpose. Now these are, First those things which hapned before; and, Secondly in the Council. First, Before the Council in *Cyril's* Letter to *Nestorius*, he tells him, that *Celestine* and the Bishops assembled at *Rome*, had advised him to enquire whether those Papers were writ by *Nestorius* or no (f). This they all falsly translate, *Celestino jubente, &c.* as if the Pope had a Power *to command* Cyril; whereas the Original Word imports no more than an intimation given him to make this enquiry; and that not by the Pope alone, but by the whole Roman Synod. Again, since this Controversie began between two Patriarchs, *Cyril* was so modest, that he would not by his own single Authority Anathematize *Nestorius*, till he had acquainted the Bishops both of the *East* and *West* with it; yet he declares he had power to have done this if he pleased (g). Now his forbearing to do this out of Prudence and Humility, is by the Roman Editors, in their Preface and Notes, ascribed most falsly to his want of Power and Authority. Thirdly, In the Protestation of the Clergy of *Constantinople*, they prove themselves Orthodox, because they held the same Faith with the Church of *Antioch*; and that which was held by *Eustathius*, Bishop there, in the time of the Nicene

(f) Μηνεύοντος —— Κελεστίνου, &c. Concil. Eph. par. 1. p. 119. *Lab.* col. 313. & *Baron. An.* 430. p. 533.

(g) *Bin.* pag. 125, & 131. *Lab.* col. 329. & col. 344.

Nicene Council, making no mention of *Rome* at all (*b*). And though now the Faith of the Roman Church is pretended to be the ſole Infallible Rule of what is Orthodox, it was not thought ſo then: For Pope *Celeſtine* himſelf ſaith *Neſtorius* is to be condemned, *unleſs he profeſs the Faith of the Roman and the Alexandrian Churches, and that which the Catholick Church held* (*i*): And the Pope repeats this in his Epiſtle to *Neſtorius* (*k*); and in that to *John*, Biſhop of *Antioch* (*l*): So that the Roman Church was then only a part of the Catholick Church as that of *Alexandria* was; had it then been (as now it is ſaid to be) the ſame with the Catholick Church, the Pope was guilty in three ſeveral Epiſtles of a notorious Tautology; for according to the modern Style) it had been enough to have ſaid *Neſtorius* muſt profeſs he held the Faith of the Roman Catholick Church. So when *Cyril* had informed *John* of *Antioch*, that the Roman Synod had condemned *Neſtorius*, and writ to him, to the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, to thoſe of *Macedon*, and to him of *Jeruſalem* to joyn in this Sentence, *Cyril* adds, *that he of* Antioch *muſt comply with this Decree, unleſs he would be deprived of the Communion of the whole Weſtern Church, and of theſe other Great Men* (*m*). This paſſage the Preface cites to prove that *Cyril* made uſe of the Popes Authority as his Chief Weapon in this Cauſe (*n*); but it is plain he doth not ſo much as mention the Pope, or the Roman Church alone, nor doth he urge the danger of loſing the Communion of that Church, ſingly conſidered, but of all the Weſtern Churches, and divers eminent ones in the *Eaſt*; and it was the Popes agreeing with all theſe that made his Communion ſo valuable. Fourthly, as to the Titles of theſe Epiſtles, which were writ before the Council, we may obſerve, that *Neſtorius* writes to *Celeſtine* as to his Brother, and ſaith he would converſe with him, *as one Brother uſe to do with another* (*o*); which ſhews, that as Patriarchs, they were upon equal ground. 'Tis true *Cyril* (who was as eminent for his Modeſty as his Learning) calls *Celeſtine* by the Title of *his Lord* (*p*), from which

(*b*) Concil. Eph. par. 1. cap. 13. *Bin.* p. 129. *Lab.* col. 340.

(*i*) Ib. cap. 15. *Bin.* p. 133. *Lab.* col. 349. & *Baron. An.* 430. p. 536.

(*k*) Cap. 18. *Bin.* p. 138. *Lab.* col. 361.

(*l*) Cap. 20. *Bin.* p. 143. *Lab.* col. 376.

(*m*) Cap. 21. *Bin.* p. 144. *Lab.* col. 380.

(*n*) Pref. *Bin.* p. 2. *Lab.* Pref. p. 3. *Baron. An.* 430. p. 539.

(*o*) Cap. 16. *Bin.* p. 133, 134. *Lab.* col. 349. & 351. *Baron. An.* 430. p. 530.

(*p*) Cap. 21. *Bin.* p. 144. *Lab.* col. 377.

which the Romaniſts would draw concluſions for their Supremacy; but we note, that in the ſame Epiſtle he calls *John* of *Antioch* alſo *his Lord, beloved Brother and Fellow-miniſter* (*q*), which very words *Cyril* uſes when he ſpeaks of *Celeſtine* in his Epiſtle to *Juvenal*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, calling the Pope there, *his Lord, moſt Religious Brother and Fellow-miniſter* (*r*); yea, ſuch was the Humility of thoſe Primitive Biſhops, that they frequently ſtiled their Equals and Inferiors their Lords; ſo *Cyril* calls *Acacius* Biſhop of *Berœa* (*s*): So *John*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, calls *Neſtorius*, *his Lord* (*t*), and the ſame Title in the ſame Epiſtle he beſtows upon *Archelaus*, Biſhop of *Mindus*, a ſmall City (*u*). And of this we might give many more inſtances, but theſe may ſuffice to expoſe thoſe vain Arguers, who from ſome ſuch Titles beſtowed on the Roman Biſhop, think to eſtabliſh his Univerſal Supremacy. Fifthly, Among all theſe preliminary Epiſtles, there are none meaner, both for Style and Senſe, than thoſe of Pope *Celeſtine*; yet *Baronius* brags of that to *Neſtorius*, as the Principal Thing which confuted him, calling it a Divine Epiſtle (*w*). But alas it is infinitely ſhort of *Cyril*'s Letters; the Phraſe is very ordinary, the Periods intricate, the Arguments ſuch as might have been uſed againſt any Heretick, and his Application of the Holy Texts very odd; as when the Church of *Conſtantinople* diſcovered *Neſtorius* to be a Heretick, he ſaith, he may uſe St. *Paul*'s words, *we know not what to pray for as we ought* (*x*). However there is one remarkable Paſſage in it (a little after) where he ſaith, *Thoſe things which the Apoſtles have fully and plainly declared to us, ought neither to be augmented nor diminiſhed.* Had his Succeſſors obſerved this Rule, a great part of their *Trent* Articles had never been eſtabliſhed: And it had been well if the Editors had not in that very Page left out by deſign, one of *Celeſtine*'s own words. For he threatens *Neſtorius*, that if after this third Admonition he did not amend, he ſhould be utterly excommunicated (ἀπὸ τῆς τῦ συνεδρίυ ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν συνόδυ) *by his Synod, and by a Council*

(*q*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* ibid.

(*r*) Cap. 24 *Bin.* pag. 147. *Lab.* col. 388.

(*s*) Cap. 22. *Bin.* pag. 145. *Lab.* col. 381.

(*t*) Ibid. cap. 25.

(*u*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 150. *Lab.* col. 393.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 430. pag. 534.

(*x*) Cap. 18. *Bin.* pag. 135. *Lab.* col. 356.

Council of all Chriſtians. Here they leave out (ὑμῶν), and tranſlate it *ab Univerſitate Collegii & conventu Chriſtianorum* (*y*); as if the Pope alone had power to ſeparate a Patriarch from the Communion of the Univerſal Church; whereas even when the Weſtern Biſhops joyned with him, St. *Cyril* notes, that thoſe who ſubmitted not to their Decree, would only loſe the Communion of the Weſtern Church (*z*): And if this Sentence were confirmed in the *Eaſt* too, then indeed *Neſtorius* and his party, as *Celeſtine* intimates, would be caſt out of the Univerſal Church. Sixthly, In *Cyril*'s Letter to *Neſtorius*, there is this remarkable Saying, *That* Peter *and* John *were* (ἰσότιμοι) *of equal Dignity, as they were both Apoſtles and Holy Diſciples* (*a*); which ſhews (for all the brags of the Popes Legate in the Council, *that* Peter *was the Head of the Faith, and of the Apoſtles*) (*b*); they did not believe there was any difference as to Power and Dignity among the Apoſtles, and that ſaying muſt paſs for a piece of Flattery, and is not to be regarded, becauſe it comes from a Creature of the Popes, and one of his own Houſe, who by the Canons was no lawful evidence (*c*). Seventhly, In the Emperor's Commiſſion to *Candidianus*, one of his great Officers, who was to preſide in the Council, we may ſee, the Emperor gives him power to appoint what Cauſes and Queſtions ſhall be firſt treated of, and to forbid any pecuniary or criminal Cauſes to be tried there (*d*); which ſhews that the Emperor reſerved the Power of managing and ordering the Synod, to himſelf, and made a Lay-man his repreſentative for that purpoſe.

(*y*) *Bin.* pag. 136. *Lab.* col. 357.

(*z*) Ep. ad *Joh.* Antioch. cap. 21. *Bin.* pag. 144. *Lab.* col. 380.

(*a*) Cap. 26. *Bin.* pag. 153. *Lab.* col. 400.

(*b*) Par. 2. Act. 2. *Bin.* pag. 235.

(*c*) Ad teſtimonium non admittendos quos ipſe accuſator de domo ſua produxerit. Concil. Carthag. 7. can. 4.

(*d*) Cap. 35. *Bin.* pag. 167. & 225. *Lab.* col. 443. & col. 594.

Secondly, As to the Paſſages in the Council, if the Preface and the Names before the Acts, be genuine (of which there is ſome doubt), we may note, that it is there declared, *the Council met by the Emperors Command*, and that *Cyril* is mentioned firſt, both in his own Right, as the chief Patriarch preſent, and as he had the precedence due to *Celeſtine*, here called *Arch-Biſhop of the Roman Church* (a Title given to *Cyril* afterwards) whoſe Legate

Legate he is no where ſaid to be, but only to have his place (*e*); that is, to ſit firſt as the Pope would have done had he been there. Moreover, it is remarkable, that the Council begins without the Popes Legates, who did not come till the three Seſſions of the firſt Act was over. But there is one notorious falſhood both in the Notes and in *Baronius*, which they deviſe purely in favour of the Pope, and to make him ſeem to have had ſome Supremacy in this Council: For they ſay, *that in the very firſt Action*, Peter, *a Prieſt of* Alexandria, *did read that which Pope* Celeſtine *and* Cyril *writ againſt* Neſtorius (*f*). Whereas the Acts of the Council ſhew the contrary, namely, that though *Peter* did ſay he had thoſe Epiſtles of *Celeſtine* and *Cyril* in his hands, yet the Council ordered, that the Emperors Edict, by which they were convened, ſhould be read in the firſt place (*g*), and it was read accordingly: *Binius*, by falſe tranſlating the Acts ſaith, *Peter* offered to read theſe Epiſtles firſt; but *Labbè* honeſtly alters that corrupt Verſion, and ſaith only, *he had them in his hands to do with them as the Synod pleaſed:* But we ſee the Synod did not allow them to be read in the firſt place; and afterwards when theſe Epiſtles were called for, *Cyril*'s Epiſtle to *Neſtorius* was firſt read and approved by the whole Synod to be Orthodox, not becauſe it was agreeable to the opinion of *Celeſtine* (whom they do not once name), but becauſe it was conformable to the Council of *Nice* (*h*): Yea the whole Council had confirmed the Faith of *Cyril*, and unanimouſly condemned *Neſtorius* before they called upon the Notary to read the Epiſtle of *Celeſtine* Arch-Biſhop of *Rome* (*i*): So that the matters contained in that Popes Epiſtle, could neither be the ſole nor principal Motive to the Council to condemn *Neſtorius*. For after the reading this Epiſtle, they alſo read other Writings of *Cyril* upon this Subject, and then heard the Opinions of the Ancient Doctors, Martyrs and Orthodox Fathers recited; as alſo a Collection of the Blaſphemies contained in *Neſtorius* his Works, and the Epiſtle of *Capreolus*, Biſhop

(*e*) Concil. Eph. par. 2. Act 1. *Bin.* pag. 168. *Lab.* col. 445.

(*f*) *Bin.* not. pag. 481. *Lab.* col. 1246. *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 568.

(*g*) *Bin.* pag. 171. *Lab.* col. 452.

(*h*) *Bin.* pag. 174, 175. *Lab.* col. 461, &c.

(*i*) *Bin.* pag. 190, 191. *Lab.* col. 501.

Biſhop of *Carthage*, declaring his conſent to their proceedings: After all which they both pronounce and ſubſcribe the ſolemn Sentence of depoſing and excommunicating *Neſtorius*, according to the Canons, and agreeable to the Decree mentioned in the Letter of *Celeſtine*, but the Sentence was paſſed in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the true and ſupream Preſident of this Aſſembly (*k*): And all this was done before *Arcadius*, *Projectus* and *Philip*, the Popes Legates, came to *Epheſus*, and yet their abſence was never objected by *Neſtorius*, as if that had invalidated theſe Acts. Further, we may obſerve that an Oath was given in this Council only upon the Holy Goſpels (according to the Proteſtant uſage) (*l*), not upon any relicts of the Saints, as the practice is now at *Rome*. In the ſecond Action, both *Baronius* and *Binius* add a word to the Text, and make the Popes Legate call the Pope when he ſpeaks to the Synod [*veſtrum Caput*] *your Head* (*m*); and *Baronius* bids the Reader obſerve, *that* Philip *the Popes Legate in open Synod profeſſed the Biſhop of* Rome *was the Head of the Catholick Church, and other Biſhops, members under this Head:* But firſt, this word [*veſtrum*] is forged by *Baronius* and *Binius*, the Greek having no more than [τῇ ἁγίᾳ κεφαλῇ] and *Labbè* hath been ſo much aſhamed of this addition, that he leaves out [*veſtro*] (*n*); and the ſenſe of the place is, that upon the Councils Acclamations by way of approving *Celeſtines* Letter as Orthodox, *Philip* gives them thanks, *that by their Holy Voices, they as Holy Members had agreed to an Holy Head*; he doth not ſay to *their Holy Head*, yet if he had, the whole Synod, and the three Legates particularly in a ſolemn Relation to the Emperor, call *Cyril the Head of the Biſhops here aſſembled* (*o*); but he would be ridiculous who ſhould thence infer That *Cyril* was the perpetual Head of the whole Catholick Church; yet we may more juſtly prove that from an Act of the whole Council, than *Baronius* doth the Popes Supremacy, from a Rhodomontado of his own Legate, who barely ſaid this, the Council neither approving nor diſap-

(*k*) *Bin.* pag. 204. *Lab.* col. 533.

(*l*) *Bin.* pag. 192. *Lab.* col. 504.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 235. *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 576.

(*n*) *Lab.* col. 619.

(*o*) Par. 2. Act. 5. *Bin.* pag 250. *Lab.* col. 655.

proving * of what he said in favour of his own Bishop. And no doubt the Orthodox Patriarchs might any of them properly be called by this Title of *an Head:* For *Cyril*, yea *Memnon*, Bishop of *Ephesus*, are so stiled in the Councils Petition to the Emperor, to set them at liberty, *lest the Synod want an Head, and all the Bishops of the World lie under an heavy burden of grief for want of their Presidents* (p). So that it is plain by these Titles, in those days, no more was meant, than that the Bishops to whom they are applied had some eminent place in the Church, and in this General Council; not that all, or any one who is called *an Head*, had, or ought to have any supream standing Jurisdiction in all times over the whole Catholick Church. So when the Council calls *Alexandria the greater Seat* (q), and *Jerusalem* is called *an Apostolical Church* (r), and Pope *Celestine* stiles *Cyril an Apostolical Man* (s); none of those Churches did ever draw any consequences from these passages, that their Bishops were *Supream Judges over the whole Catholick Church*; that absurdity is peculiar to the Parasites of *Rome*, who make this Inference from every Honourable Title, that is, any where, or upon any occasion, by way of Complement, or seriously bestowed upon the Pope; but since others had the same Titles given them upon Occasion, it is plain there is no good ground for such Conclusions. It is further memorable, that when *John*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, would have usurped a Jurisdiction over the Bishops of *Cyprus*, the Council of *Ephesus* decreed, *that no Bishop should have, or assume any Power over those Provinces which had not been under him or his Predecessors before that time* (t); which Decree plainly condemns the Bishop of *Rome* usurping a Jurisdiction over this Island of *Britain* since the Ephesine Council, because it was not under any of the Popes, either then, or of many years after. Finally, we may note, that *John*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, being secretly a favourer of *Nestorius*, would not joyn with *Cyril* or *Celestine* in condemning him, but held a separate Council with such Bishops as were of his

* Vide dictum Imp. Justiniani ap. Richer. Tom. 1. cap. 7. §. 9. p. 299. *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 2. pag. 162, 163.

(p) *Bin.* pag. 304. *Lab.* col. 786.

(q) Act. 4. *Bin.* pag. 243. *Lab.* col. 638.

(r) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 244. *Lab.* col. 641.

(s) Par. 3. cap. 23. *Bin.* pag. 416. *Lab.* col. 1077.

(t) *Bin.* pag. 206. *Lab.* col. 801.

his party, and there they Excommunicated and Depoſed *Cyril* and *Memnon* with all that joyned with them. On the other ſide, the lawful general Council Excommunicated *John* of *Antioch* and his accomplices; and afterwards upon his Repentance *Cyril* declares, he *reſtored him to Communion upon the terms preſcribed by the true Council of* Epheſus (*u*). Now if the Pope of *Rome* had then been known and believed to be the ſupreme head of the Catholick Church, and the only infallible Judge in matters of Faith; how could the Biſhop of *Antioch* ſo much as pretend to Condemn that ſide on which *Celeſtine* was, or to reject that Council wherein his Legates ſat and voted againſt him? Or how came the Pious Emperor *Theodoſius*, and his Officers ſo openly and ſo long to abet the party of *John* of *Antioch*, againſt that of *Celeſtine* and *Cyril*? There needed but two Arguments, *viz.* thoſe of the Popes Infallibility and Supremacy, to have confounded all the pretences of this Schiſmatical Council, and they are not ſo much as once mentioned; Which is a certain Evidence, that neither ſide knew of, or believed theſe Papal Priviledges, uſurped in later times by that encroaching See.

(*u*) Par. 3. cap. 38. *Bin.* pag. 447. *Lab.* col. 1153.

Fourthly, I come to conſider the confirmation of the Acts of this general Council: And this the Preface aſcribes intirely to the Pope (*w*), and ſo do the Notes after the Council upon the word [Approved] (*x*), and ſo doth *Baronius* in ſeveral places: But all this is without any juſt ground; For the Preface ſaith, he ſent his Legates *to confirm the Acts of the Council in his name*, and cites for this theſe words out of *Celeſtine*'s Letter ſent to the Synod by theſe Legates: *And what you decree, ſhall be accounted, defined and determined for the tranquility of all Churches* (*y*). But no ſuch words are in that Epiſtle, the Pope ſaying no more, but only *that he had ſent theſe Perſons to be preſent at their Acts, and to confirm what he had long ſince decreed**; *To which he hoped their Holineſs would aſſent, becauſe they knew that which*

(*w*) *Bin.* Pref. pag. 5. *Lab.* col. 10.

(*x*) *Bin.* Notis. pag. 478. *Lab.* col. 1244.

(*y*) Præfat. *Bin.* pag. 5. *Lab.* col. 10.

* Editio Peltani & Contij ita legit—— Actis veſtris interernnt, quæque à vobis ſunt conſtituta ſuo calculo denuò confirmabunt. Richer. Hiſt. Concil. Tom. 1. cap. 7. pag. 294.

was determined, was for the peace of all Churches (z). The ſenſe of which is, that *Celeſtine* having long before Condemned *Neſtorius* at *Rome*, he ſent his Legates to the general Council to get that Sentence confirmed, and doubted not of their aſſent to it, ſince this caſting out of *Neſtorius* (the diſturber of the Churches quiet) would tend to the Peace of the whole Church: So that this paſſage proves, that the Council was to confirm the Popes Decree, not that he was to confirm their Acts: And the Synod in their Letter to Pope *Celeſtine* do expreſly ſay, *That they had judged his Sentence againſt the Pelagians ſhould remain firm and be valid, &c.* adding *that they had ſent him the Acts of the Synod and the Subſcriptions, that he might know what was done* (a). But there is not one word deſiring him to confirm their Decrees: But as to the Emperors, the caſe is clear; For the Synod and the three Legates of the Pope addreſs to them, *to Command that what this General Council had done againſt* Neſtorius *might be in force, being confirmed by their conſent and approbation* (b). And they Petition the Emperors *to make null and void the falſe Synods uncanonical proceedings againſt* Cyril *and* Memnon (c). And in another Relation to the Emperors, they put both theſe requeſts together (d): And *Sozomen* ſaith in expreſs terms, that *the Emperor by his ſuffrage confirmed their Acts* (e): Yea theſe Teſtimonies are ſo expreſs, that *Binius* himſelf in his Notes at laſt grants, *That the Emperor dimiſſed the Biſhops*, adding this Decree, *that the Sentence of this Holy General Council againſt* Neſtorius *ſhould ſtand in full force* (f). So that nothing but the prodigious partiality of *Baronius* and *Binius* for the Popes ſupremacy could put them upon inventing ſo groundleſs a Story, as that of the Popes confirming the Decrees of this Council; which he did no otherwiſe than all other eminent Orthodox Biſhops, that is, by conſenting to their Acts, and applauding them afterwards.

(z) Concil. par. 2. Act. 2. *Bin.* pag. 234. *Lab.* col. 618.

(a) Par. 2. Act. 5. *Bin.* pag. 254. *Lab.* col. 666, & 667.

(b) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 251. *Lab.* col 659. *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 579.

(c) *Bin.* pag. 304. *Lab.* col. 786.

(d) *Bin.* pag. 295. *Lab.* col. 766, 767.

(e) *Sozom.* Hiſt. lib. 7. cap. 9. pag. 419.

(f) *Bin.* not. pag. 483. *Lab.* col. 1251. Richer. cap. 7. §. 12. p. 307. The Emperors Letter in the Pſeudo-Synod ſaith, *The confirmation of the Acts ſhould have been obtained from him*: And there *Bin.* his Note is, *How this confirmation is to be underſtood, other imperial Letters ſhew.* *Bin.* pag. 270. *Lab.* col. 706.

§. 2. Some

§. 2. Some other ſcattered paſſages there are which we will briefly put together here before we conclude this diſcourſe. The Preface boaſts much of the words of *Firmus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and cites them thus, *that the Synod had followed that which* Celeſtine *had preſcribed, and being compelled by his Authority had paſſed Sentence on* Neſtorius *and his Opinion* (*g*); and a little after, *Firmus* his words are otherwiſe cited in the ſame Preface, viz. *That* Celeſtine *had preſcribed a certain Rule for this buſineſs, which the Council following, obſerving diligently the form of the Canons, they had inflicted the Canonical and Apoſtolical Judgment* † *upon him* (*b*); and hence they infer, *that the Pope had commanded the Eaſtern Biſhops, to Decree over again and execute his Sentence againſt* Neſtorius (*i*); Yea *Baronius* is ſo bold as to affirm. *That* Celeſtine *ſent his Legates, not to ſubject the Cauſe of* Neſtorius *to a new Examination, but only to ſee his Sentence Executed; and that neither did he allow the* ‖*Council any more than only to Execute his Decree; nor did this general Council Arrogate any thing to it ſelf, but to Act according to his Sentence* (*k*). According to which account, this Council of *Epheſus* was a mear mock Aſſembly, and all theſe Biſhops no more than Officers under the Pope, to put his Decrees in Execution. But that this is moſt notoriouſly falſe appears; firſt, from their falſe citing of the words of *Firmus*, who truly quoted ſaith thus. *The Apoſtolical ſeat of* Celeſtine *formerly gave his ſuffrage, and ſet a Pattern in this buſineſs* (*l*). And a little after, *which we alſo following —— have put in force that Form, decreeing both a Canonical and Apoſtolical judgment againſt him*: The ſenſe of which is this; That whereas the Pope in his Roman Synod had condemned *Neſtorius* unleſs he repented in ten days, this general Council approving of that Sentence, had upon *Neſtorius* his refuſal to appear after divers admonitions, condemned him alſo: So that he was now not only cenſured by one Apoſtolical See, but canonically alſo by all the Biſhops of a general Council: And that this is the Senſe,

(*g*) Præfat. *Bin.* pag. 2. *Lab.* col. 4.

† Richerius ſhews that the Apoſtolical Judgment is meant of the Synods Sentence. Tom. 1. §. 9. pag. 297.

(*h*) *Bin.* ibid. pag. 4. *Lab.* col. 8.

(*i*) *Bin.* ut ſupr. pag. 2. *Lab.* col. 4.

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 559.

(*l*) Πεῤῥιεῦν Ψήφον ἐπὶ σχέσι, ἢ τύπον τῷ πεζιγμαῖι, &c. Par. 2. Act. 2. *Bin.* pag. 235. *Lab.* col. 618.

Senſe, is evident from the words of the Synod it ſelf in the Preface to the Sentence by them pronounced, *being convinced by divers proof, that* Neſtorius *holds impious Opinions, we are forced by the Canons and the Epiſtle of* Celeſtine *our Fellow-Miniſter, even with Tears to come to this ſevere Sentence againſt him, &c.* (*m*) We ſee they name the Canons firſt, and before *Celeſtine*'s Epiſtle, as laying an obligation upon them ſo to proceed; and they call the Pope their Fellow-Miniſter; nor was it his Authority, but his having proceeded according to the Canons, that laid the neceſſity upon this great Council to follow his Example, and imitate the Pattern he had ſet them. For nothing is plainer, than that the Council did always intend to examin this Cauſe over again; and for that reaſon they cited *Neſtorius*, and read firſt the Letters of *Cyril* and then of *Celeſtine*; and after a full hearing both of the Fathers Opinions, and of the Blaſphemies collected out of *Neſtorius* his Writings, finding him finally obſtinate, they pronounce Sentence on him, not in the Popes name, but thus, *Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whom he hath Blaſphemed, by this Holy Council Decrees, that* Neſtorius *ſhall be deprived of his Epiſcopal dignity, and ſhall be excluded out of the Communion of Biſhops* (*n*). This certainly was an Original Decree, in the name of the General Council, and by the Authority they derived from Chriſt, by which they gave force and validity to the Sentence formerly pronounced by the Pope and his Roman Council; which had ſignified nothing (againſt his Equal, a Patriarch of the Eaſtern Church, over whom he had no juriſdiction) if it had not been thus confirmed: So that it is a ſtrange extravagance to talk, as if a whole general Council in that Age were convened to no other end, but only to execute the Popes Decree blindly, without any enquiry into the merits of the Cauſe: And *Celeſtine*'s own Letter (cited by *Baronius* to make out this Fiction) declares he believes, *the Spirit of God was preſent with the Council* (*o*), of which there had been no need, if all their buſineſs had been only to execute

(*m*) Par. 2. Act. 1 *Bin.* pag. 204. *Lab.* col.

(*n*) *Bin. Lab.* ut ſupr.

(*o*) *Baron. An.* 431 pag. 559.

execute a Sentence paſſed before: There is alſo great prevarication uſed by the Cardinal and *Binius*, about the caſe of *John B.* of *Antioch*, one of the Patriarchs ſummoned to this Council: This *John* was *Neſtorius* his old Friend, for they had both been bred in the Church of *Antioch*; and he having (as *Baronius* relates) received Letters both from *Celeſtine* and *Cyril*, (before the general Council was called,) importing that *Neſtorius* was Condemned both at *Rome* and *Alexandria*, if he did not recant within ten days; writes to *Neſtorius* to perſwade him for peace ſake to yield, telling him what trouble was like to befal him, after theſe Letters were publiſhed (*p*): Here *Baronius* puts into the Text *theſe Letters*, that is, *of the Pope of* Rome: As if the Pope were the ſole Judge in this matter, and his Authority alone to be feared; whereas the Epiſtle it ſelf tells *Neſtorius*, *he had received many Letters, one from* Celeſtine, *and all the reſt from* Cyril (*q*). So that this Parentheſis contradicts the Text, and was deſigned to deceive the Reader. But to go on with the Hiſtory, though *Neſtorius* would not ſubmit to *John* upon this Admonition, yet he had no mind to condemn him; and therefore he came late to *Epheſus*, after the Council was aſſembled, and when he was come would not appear nor joyn with the Biſhops there, but with a party of his own held an oppoſite Synod, and condemned *Cyril* and *Memnon* with the reſt, as unjuſtly proceeding againſt *Neſtorius*, and by falſe Suggeſtions to the Emperor, he procured both *Cyril* and *Memnon* to be Impriſoned. Now among others in the Orthodox Council, who reſented theſe illegal Acts *, *Juvenalis* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* ſaith, *That* John *of* Antioch *ought to have appeared and purged himſelf, conſidering the Holy, Great and General Council, and the Apoſtolical ſeat of old* Rome *therein repreſented, and that he ought to obey and reverence the Apoſtolical and Holy Church of* Jeruſalem; *by which eſpecially, according to Apoſtolical Order and Tradition, the Church of* Antioch *was to be directed and judged* (*r*); alluding no doubt to that paſſage *Acts* xv. where

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 430. pag. 540. cum pag. 542.

(*q*) Vid. init. Epiſt. ap. *Baron.* & *Bin.* Par. 1. Cap. 85. pag. 148. *Lab.* col. 389.

* Juvenalis *ſpeaks, becauſe* Cyril *and* Memnon *being now accuſed, left their places and ſtood at the Bar. Richer.* Tom. 1. §. 11. pag. 304. cap. 7.

(*r*) Par. 2. Act. 4. *Bin.* pag. 244. *Lab.* col. 641.

where the Errors ariſing at *Antioch*, were rectified and condemned in the Council at *Jeruſalem*. But *Baronius* falſly cites theſe words of *Juvenalis*, as if he had ſaid, John *ought to have appeared at leaſt, becauſe of the Legates ſent from* Rome; *eſpecially ſi ice by Apoſtolical Order and ancient Tradition, it was become a cuſtom, that the See of* Antioch *ſhould always be directed and judged by that of* Rome (*s*). And *Binus* (in his Notes) tranſcribes this Sentence as *Baronius* had perverted, mangled and falſified it (*t*). Which Forgery being ſo eaſily confuted by looking back into the Acts of the Council, and ſo apparently deviſed to ſupport the Papal Supremacy, is enough to ſhew how little theſe Writers are to be truſted, when fictions or lying will ſerve the ends of their darling Church. After this the Preface tells us, that though *John* ſtill continued obſtinate, *the Synod referred the depoſing of him to the Popes pleaſure* (*u*); as if they had done nothing in this matter themſelves. But the Councils Letter to *Celeſtine* ſays, *That though they might juſtly proceed againſt him, with all the ſeverity he had uſed againſt* Cyril; *yet reſolving to overcome his raſhneſs with moderation, they referred that to* Celeſtine's *judgment; but in the mean time, they had Excommunicated him and his party, and deprived them of all Epiſcopal power, ſo that they could hurt none by their Cenſures* (*w*). Therefore the Council both Excommunicated and deprived him by their own Authority, and only left it to the Pope, whether any greater ſeverity ſhould be uſed againſt him or no: 'Tis true not only the Pope (*x*), but the Emperor (*y*) afterwards moved, that means ſhould be uſed to reconcile this Biſhop and his Party to the Catholick Church, by ſuſpending this Sentence a while, and procuring a meeting between *Cyril* and *John*: But ſtill it muſt not be denied, both that the Council cenſured him their own Authority; and that *Cyril* without any leave from the Pope, did upon *John*'s condemning *Neſtorius*, receive him into the Communion of the Catholick Church (*z*). Yet becauſe *Sixtus* the Succeſſor of Pope *Celeſtine*, among other Biſhops was certified

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 578.

(*t*) Notis ad Concil. Epheſ. *Bin.* pag. 482. *Lab.* col. 1249.

(*u*) Pref. ap. *Bin.* pag. 3. *Lab.* col. 7.

(*w*) Par. 2. Act. 5. pag. 254. *Bin. Lab.* col. 666.

(*x*) Par. 3. cap. 20. *Bin.* pag. 414. *Lab.* col. 1072.

(*y*) Ibid. cap. 24. *Bin.* pag. 418. *Lab.* col. 1081.

(*z*) Par. 3. cap. 38. *Bin.* pag. 447. *Lab.* col. 1153.

fied of this, thence the Notes and *Baronius* infer, that this reconciliation also was by the Authority of the See of *Rome*: Whereas *Cyril*'s own Letter shews, that the Terms of admitting *John* to Communion, were prescribed by the Council and the Emperor, and that *Cyril* alone effected this great work.

We may further observe, *Binius* in his Notes tells us, *that after the condemnation of* Nestorius, *the Fathers shouted forth the praise of* Celestine, *who had censured him before* (*a*). And *Baronius* saith, *the Acclamations followed the condemning of* Nestorius, *in which they wonderfully praised* Celestine, *as the Synodal Letter to the Emperor testifies* (*b*). By which a Man would think, that *Celestine* had the only Glory of this Action. But if we look into the first Act of the Council, there are no Acclamations expressed there at all after the condemnation of *Nestorius*; and the Synodical Letter to the Emperor, cited by *Baronius*, hath no more, but [ἐπαινέσαντες] *viz.* that they praised *Celestine*, which imports only their commending his Sentence; whereas in that first Act every one of the Bishops present, makes a particular Encomium in the praise of *Cyril*'s Faith, as being in all things agreeing to the Nicene Creed, which fills up at least forty pages together in *Labbe*'s Edition (*c*). As for the Acclamations, they are in the second Act, and in them *Cyril* is equally praised with *Celestine*; for the Fathers say, *To* Celestine, *another* Paul; *to* Cyril, *another* Paul; *to* Celestine, *keeper of the Faith*; *to* Celestine, *agreeing with the Synod*; *to* Celestine, *the whole Synod gives thanks*; *one* Celestine, *one* Cyril, *one Faith of the Synod, one Faith of the whole World* (*d*). This was just after the reading of *Celestine*'s Letter, brought by his Legates to the Council; yet we see even when the occasion led them only to speak of the Pope, the Fathers joyn *Cyril* with him, knowing that *Celestine*'s Sentence, as well as his Information, was owing intirely to *Cyril*'s Learning and Zeal.

(*a*) *Bin.* Not. pag. 481. *Lab.* col. 1247.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 570.

(*c*) *Bin.* pag. 175. *Lab.* col. 461, ad col. 501.

(*d*) Par. 2. Act. 2. *Bin.* pag. 235. *Lab.* col. 618.

Moreover we have another touch of their ſincerity about the Virgin *Mary*; For *Baronius* calls the people of *Epheſus The Virgins Clients, Subjects and Worſhippers*, adding, — *That as they had once cried out, great is* Diana, *ſo now being converted, they ſet out* Mary *the Mother of God with high and inceſſant Praiſes, and perſevered to venerate her with a more willing Service, and to addreſs to her by a more ſolemn Worſhip* (e). By which one would imagin, that in the time of this Council, and ever ſince, the Bleſſed Virgin had been worſhipped as ſhe is now at *Rome*; but there is not one word of this true, except only that ſhe was there declared to be the Mother of God: That Epiſtle of *Cyril's*, from whence *Baronius* proves this, ſaith nothing of either Praiſes or Worſhip given to the Bleſſed Virgin; he ſaith indeed, *that when the people heard* Neſtorius *was depoſed, they began with one voice to commend the Synod, and to glorifie God, becauſe the Enemy of the Faith was caſt down.* And when he had related what Honours the People did them by carrying Lamps and burning Incenſe before them, he adds, *Thus our Saviour manifeſted his Glory and his Power of doing all things, to thoſe who blaſphemed him* (f): So that all this ſtory of their praiſing and venerating the Bleſſed Virgin, is his own Fiction; as is alſo that other conjecture of his, that the Synodal Epiſtle declares, *that* John *the Evangeliſt, and* Mary *the Mother of God once lived together at* Epheſus (g): For that Synodal Epiſtle ſpeaks only of two Churches there called by their Names (h). So when he and *Binius* ſay, *it is believed that this Addition to the Angelical Salutation was then made, Holy* Mary, *Mother of God, pray for us* (i); and *Baronius* adds, *that all the Faithfull uſe to ſay, and often repeat this, and teach it their Children, even while they ſuck'd the Breaſts.* But I ask, Why doth any Man believe this? Is it barely becauſe *Baronius* ſays ſo? Doth not he ſay an hundred falſe things to juſtifie the Corruptions of *Rome*? Or can he produce one ancient Author, about this time, or of divers Ages after, wherein this Phraſe, *Mother of God pray for us*, is uſed? It is certain

(e) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 570, 571.

(f) *Baron.* ib. vid. Epiſt. ap. *Bin.* pag. 216. *Lab.* col. 574.

(g) *Baron.* ib. pag. 571.

(h) *Bin.* ut ſupr. & ita *Lab.*

(i) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 601. *Bin.* not. pag. 483. *Lab.* col. 1252.

certain he cannot *; and therefore this blasphemous addition is much later than the Council of *Ephesus*; and the Custom of saying it and teaching it to their Children, is a Scandalous Innovation, brought in by the Roman Church in the Superstitious Ages, and justly rejected by us who keep close to Antiquity, in owning the Blessed Virgin to be the Mother of God, but do not Worship her or Pray to her. And thus much for the Council of *Ephesus*, whose Acts being extant at large, do abundantly confute the Popes Supremacy, and set forth many other Usages and Practices of *Rome*, to be Innovations and Corruptions.

* Cyrilli verba sunt Γένοιτο δὲ ἡμᾶς —— σέβειν τὴν ἀδιάστατον τριάδα ὑμνοῦντας τὴν ἀειπάρθενον Μαρίαν — καὶ τὸν ταύτης υἱὸν —— ὅτι αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα, &c. Homil. *Cyril.* in fine *Bin.* pag. 222. *Lab.* pag. 590. Ubi cultum attribuit Sanctæ Trinitati, Gloriam Christo, at solum Laudes Beatæ Virgini.

§. 3. After *Celestine*'s death, Pope *Sixtus* or *Xystus* the Third succeeded, who sate about eight years, but did few Memorable things: In his younger days he was not only a Favourer, but a Patron of the Pelagians (*k*), though afterwards he writ against them, and strenuously opposed them (*l*). Wherefore *Baronius* doth not sufficiently prove those three Tracts (*Of Riches, Of Evil Teachers*, and *of Chastity*) which go under the name of this Pope, were not his, by saying there are divers Pelagian Doctrines in them; since if they were writ in his youth, *Xystus* was then a Pelagian himself. This Pope writ (as is said) three Epistles, two of which are put into the Council of *Ephesus*, because they shew *Xystus* his Consent to what the Council had done, and to *Cyril*'s actings afterwards as to *John*, Bishop of *Antioch*: In the later of these Epistles, there is a memorable Saying, cited by *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *Let there be no liberty for Novelty hereafter, since it is not convenient to add any thing unto that which is Old* (*m*). Had his Sucessors minded this good Rule, the Roman Church had not added so many New Doctrines and Practices to those Old Ones, which were received and used before *Xystus* his time. The Pontifical relates a Sory of one *Bassus*, who accused this Pope of Adultery, and that

An. Dom. 432.

(*k*) Aug. ad *Sixt.* Presb. ep. 104, & 105.

(*l*) *Prosp.* adv. Collat. & Chro. An. 440.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 486. *Lab.* col. 1262. *Baron. An.* 432. p. 618.

a Synod of 56 Biſhops, convened by the Emperor's Order, cleared him, and condemned his Accuſer. Now for the greater credit of this Pope, ſome have forged a third Epiſtle, wherein he is made to ſignifie to them his purging himſelf upon Oath: But *Labbe* condemns the whole Epiſtle as ſpurious, and *Binius* rejects it, becauſe it is ſtolen in part out of Pope *Fabian* his third Epiſtle, and becauſe the Date is wrong (*n*); for theſe Arguments will ſerve to condemn an Epiſtle, that ſuppoſes a Pope accuſed and tried by his Peers, whereas, had it been for the Supremacy, *Binius* would have juſtified it, though it had theſe and greater faults. Beſides this Epiſtle, ſome illiterate Monk hath forged the Acts of this Council, wherein the Pope was tried; and though there be neither Latin nor Senſe in it (being as dull as that of *Sinueſſa*) but the Inventor deſigning to do Honour to the Pope, is very gently cenſured both by *Baronius* and *Binius* (*o*). And to this they have tacked another ſuch a Council of the Trial of *Polychronius*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, before Pope *Sixtus*, for attempting to challenge the Precedency before *Rome*, &c. And *Binius* confeſſeth not only, that Pope *Nicholas* alledged this Council for good Authority, but that the Modern Writers of their Church do ſo alſo: Whereas he owns there was no ſuch man Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, and that the whole Story and Acts are a Fiction of no credit in the World (*p*); by which we may learn to be cautious how we truſt the Roman Writers (Ancient or Modern) when they cite Records to ſupport the Grandeur of the Church.

(*n*) *Bin.* pag. 486, 487. *Lab.* col. 1263-1265

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 489. *Lab.* col. 1265. *Baron. An.* 433. pag. 641.

(*p*) Not. *Bin.* pag. 494. *Lab.* col. 1283.

An. Dom. 439. About this time *Theodoret* mentions a great Council at *Conſtantinople*, under *Theodoſius*, about ſetling the Precedence of the Eaſtern Patriarchats, on occaſion of a Conteſt between the Churches of *Alexandria*, *Conſtantinople* and *Antioch*. *Baronius* (and out of him *Binius*) in relating this, have added to *Theodoret*'s words, that *Alexandria* claimed the Priority before all the Eaſtern Biſhops, *becauſe he was the firſt Biſhop of the Catholick Church after the Pope:* But the Quotation he produces out

out of *Theodort*, *Ep.* 86. doth not ſo much as mention *Rome* nor the Pope: So that they have invented that part of the Story to keep up their Churches Credit. However this Council evidently ſhews (*q*), that the Roman Church had nothing to do with the *Eaſt*; they called great Councils without him, and ſetled the Precedencies of their own Patriarchats without taking notice of the Pope. As for *Sixtus*, he made no figure in the World; and all we hear of him further is, that being warned by *Leo* his Deacon (and Succeſſor afterwards) he diſcovered and prevented the Attempts of *Julianus* of *Hecla*, a Pelagian Heretick, who endeavoured to get into the Churches Communion, as *Proſper* informs us, *An.* 440. *in Chron.* In this year was held the Synod of *Riez*, in the Province of *Narbon*, dated by the Emperors and Conſuls, without any mention of the Pope (*r*). For it was held under *Hilary*, Biſhop of *Arles*, who firſt ſubſcribes, and is meant in the Canons by the name of the Metropolitan, as *Marca* confeſſes (*s*). And though *Binius* have no Notes to this purpoſe, I muſt obſerve, that this *Hilary* of *Arles*, as Primate of thoſe parts of *France*, calls a Provincial Council, depoſes a Biſhop of *Ambrun*, uncanonically choſen, and makes divers Decrees with his fellow Biſhops, who doubtleſs were not then ſo much enſlaved to the Pope, as in after times.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 439. pag. 678. *Bin.* pag. 495. *Lab.* col. 1284.

(*r*) *Bin.* pag. 495. *Lab.* col. 1284.

(*s*) De *Marca* de ſac. & imper. lib. 5. cap. 31. pag. 93.

§. 4. *Leo* the Firſt ſucceeded *Xyſtus*, being an active, bold and aſpiring Man, ſo that he concerned himſelf in all the affairs of Chriſtendom, and every where laboured to advance the Roman Supremacy*, for which he had a favourable conjuncture by the misfortunes which then hapned to all other great Churches. The Africans were under a cruel perſecution; the Eaſtern Church diſtracted with Hereſie, and a woful Schiſm; the Orthodox Biſhops in the *Eaſt* betrayed, and oppreſſed by three of the four Patriarchs, and the fourth of the Eaſtern Patriarchs condemned and murdered; the Emperor of the *Weſt* very young, and he in the *Eaſt*

An. Dom. 440.

* Permaximum fuiſſe Authoritatis Papalis amplificationem. *Richer.* de Leon. hiſt. concil. univ. Tom. 1. pag. 336.

Eaſt a weak man: and both governed by devout and zealous Women: All which circumſtances contributed to make *Leo* (who was always Orthodox and powerful) very great. The Pontifical relates but few of his Actions, and thoſe with many miſtakes (*t*); but becauſe all the following Councils give us ſo much of his Life, I ſhall only make ſome remarks upon the Pontifical, and take the reſt in the order of time. *Firſt*, 'Tis ſaid there *he found out two Hereſies, the Eutychian and the Neſtorian*: But the Neſtorian Hereſie was found out and condemned long before his time; and as for *Eutyches*, he was found out and cenſured by *Flavianus*, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, before *Leo* took him for a Heretick; yea, he writ a kind Letter to this Heretick (*u*), and two angry Letters in his behalf to the Emperor and *Flavianus* (*w*), becauſe he was excommunicated. And till he was informed by the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* what dangerous Doctrines he held, *Leo* inclined to be *Eutyches* friend, for which (indeed) afterwards he made ample amends, in aſſiſting toward *Eutyches* condemnation. *Secondly*, The Pontifical variouſly and falſly reports the number of Biſhops in the Council of *Chalcedon*, and is miſtaken in ſaying, *Pulcheria was preſent with* Martianus *there*, and that they confeſſed their Faith before the Council, deſiring them to ſend to Pope *Leo to expound the Faith:* And that *Leo* after this did write a Tract, condemning all Hereſies; all which are groſs miſtakes: But it is true, that he writ many Epiſtles, and frequently ſhewed his approbation of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and that he did prevail with *Attila*, King of the *Hunns*, to deal gently with *Rome*, when it was in his power to have deſtroyed it. 'Tis very probable alſo, that he added ſome paſſages to the Roman Office, and that he ordered ſome to watch the Church of St. *Peter* and *Paul*, to which, in this Age, many began to make Viſits and Oblations. But *Binius* his Notes add divers incredible Stories, as that about the Hearſe-Cloth, which bled when *Leo* clip'd it with Sciſſors, which *Gregory* mentions

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 497. *Lab.* col. 1290.

(*u*) *Leon.* ep. 6. pag. 95.

(*w*) *Leon.* ep. 7, & 8.

ons near 100 year after only as a report, which he could not cite any Author for: And another Story or two out of *Sophronius* his *Pratum Spirituale*, a Book ſtuffed with Fables, as *Baronius* himſelf confeſſeth (*x*), for having cited a falſe Story out of this Author, he hath theſe words, *ſince he put ſo many lies together in this one Narration, what credit can be given to the reſt?* Yet *Baronius* himſelf cites this Author for Miracles and Viſions, very oft, and in one place relates two Miracles out of *Sophronius*, for the glory of that Epiſtle which Pope *Leo* writ to *Flavianus* againſt *Eutyches* and *Neſtorius*. An Epiſtle indeed very Orthodox, and at that time very ſeaſonable, but far from meriting thoſe prodigious Encomiums *Baronius* or the Legends give it, who magnifie it as if it equalled the Creed, and proved the Pope alone was to define all controverſies of Faith, to teach General Councils what they were to believe, and to give Laws to all Biſhops in the World (*y*). But whatever excellency there is in this Epiſtle (which is in number the Xth, and printed in the Council of *Chalcedon* (*z*), it is not to be aſcribed to Pope *Leo*, but to the learned *Proſper*, who was his *Amanuenſis*, and wrote not only this, but many other Letters for him; ſo that the Senſe and Phraſe is *Proſper's*, only they are writ in *Leo's* name, as *Gennadius* teſtifies, who lived but fifty year after *Leo* became Pope (*a*); and the ſame is affirmed by *Trithemius* (*b*): And we may obſerve, that an Epiſtle of this very *Proſper's* againſt the Pelagians (as we noted before) went under Pope *Celeſtine's* name, but far exceeded the Style of *Celeſtine's* own Letters: I only add, that *Labbè* here prints all theſe Epiſtles which bear *Leo's* name (*c*), ſome of which I ſhall have occaſion to conſider afterwards.

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 407. n 35. pag. 261.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 80, & 81.

(*z*) *Lab.* Tom. 4. pag. 344.

(*a*) *Gennad.* catal. ap. Hieron. Tom. 1. pag. 402.

(*b*) *Trithem.* de ſcript. in *Proſp.* fol. 37. & *Marcellin.* in Chron.

(*c*) *Lab.* col. 1293.

The firſt Council of *Orange*, *Binius* intitles *under Leo*; but *Labbè*, aſhamed of that groſs pretence, leaves theſe words out (*d*). For it was called by, and held under *Hilary*, Biſhop of *Arles*, who exerciſed the Juriſdiction of a Metropolitan and Primate in thoſe parts; and all the Biſhops of thoſe parts owned his Primacy, and met

An. Dom. 441.

(*d*) *Bin.* pag. 498. *Lab.* col. 1446.

met at his Summons (*e*), of which *Binius* takes no notice. There were made in this Synod many good Canons for Diſcipline, which were obſerved in the Gallican Church, without any confirmation from the Pope. At the end of this Council is publiſhed a Form of Excommunication, and a very excellent Office for reconciling Penitents, ſuppoſed to be made in this Council, which proves Forms had then been long in uſe.

(*e*) P. de *Mar.* lib. 5. pag. 94.

An. Dom. 442. (*f*) *Bin.* pag. 501. *Lab.* col.

The ſecond Council at *Vaſatis*, or *Bazai* in *France* (*f*), ſeems to me to be wrong dated; for I obſerve the fourth Canon cites a paſſage out of St. *Hierom*, with this Title, *One of the Fathers aſſerts*, &c. Now St. *Hierom* died but 20 year before the date of this Council, and could hardly ſo ſoon have been cited by the Title of *One of the Fathers*; beſides, the ſixth Canon cites one of the ſpurious Epiſtles of *Clement*, forged after this Age. But the fifth Canon orders, *him who is aggrieved with the Sentence of his Biſhop, to appeal to a Synod*; which ſhews, that reſerving Cauſes to *Rome* was not allowed or uſed then.

An. Dom. 444. (*g*) *Bin.* p. 502. *Lab.* (*h*) *Baron. An.* 445. pag. 14. Tom. 6.

The Editors have a Roman Council of Pope *Leo*'s, which was no more than a Solemn meeting of the Clergy and Laity, to examine the Manichean Hereticks (*g*). But there were two remarkable things in *Leo*'s proceeding againſt them, of which the Notes ſay nothing; but *Baronius* informs us (*h*), *Firſt*, That he diſcovered the Manicheans by their refuſing to drink of the Cup in the Bleſſed Sacrament, which this Pope counts a great impiety in this ſort of People, not foreſeeing that his Succeſſors would take the Cup away from all the People of that Church. And this paſſage makes it clear, that all the People at *Rome*, who were Orthodox, did receive the Cup then, or elſe the Hereticks not receiving it could not have diſcovered them. *Secondly*, *Baronius* notes, that becauſe theſe Manicheans idolatrouſly adored the riſing Sun; *Leo* forbid the Orthodox People to uſe that innocent and ancient Cuſtom of bowing toward the *Eaſt*, for the peril of Idolatry: Now

Now had there been any Images adored in his time; for the ſame reaſon he muſt rather have forbidden bowing down before them.

The ſecond Council at *Rome* under *Leo*, was in the Cauſe of *Hilary* Biſhop of *Arles*, who had juſtly depoſed a ſcandalous Biſhop in a Provincial Synod (*i*). But he (as ſuch ill Men had often done) flies to *Rome* to complain; and *Leo* not conſidering the equity of the cenſure, but *Hilary*'s having acted as a Primate in thoſe parts of *France*, contrary to the Decrees of former Popes, eſpouſes this evil Biſhops Quarrel, being more concerned for his deſigned uſurpation of a ſupremacy, than the honour of the Church. Upon this *Hilary*, who was one of the moſt pious and learned Men of that Age, goes on foot to *Rome*, and requires the Pope to act *more ſolito, in the accuſtomed manner, and not to admit ſuch to Communion, who had been juſtly condemned in their own Country* (*k*); and when he ſaw the Pope was reſolved to break the Canons, and ſet up his Supremacy by right or wrong, he ſuddenly departs from *Rome* without taking any leave of *Leo*, for which the Angry Pope writes to the Biſhops of *France*, declaring *Hilary*'s Acts *null*, and depriving him of his Power, to Congregate Synods and Depoſe Biſhops, &c. (*l*) And though he brags much of his univerſal Authority, &c. in that Epiſtle, yet knowing how little this would ſignifie to *Hilary* and the reſt of the French Biſhops, he gets an Edict from the Emperor *Valentinian* to back his Orders, which becauſe there are ſome great words for the Popes Supremacy in it, *Baronius* magnifies as *worthy of perpetual Memory* (*m*). And ſince their Champions alledge this Edict as a proof of the Roman univerſal Supremacy, I will obſerve upon it, Firſt, That it was eaſie for the Pope to cite falſe Canons to a young and eaſy Emperor, and perſuade him, that the Councils had given him this Supremacy, as his Predeceſſors had lately done in *Africa*. Secondly, That the Pope probably drew up this Edict himſelf, and ſo put in theſe Flouriſhes about his own Au-

An. Dom. 445. (*i*) *Lab.* col. 1461. (*k*) *Lab.* col. 1462. (*l*) *Leon.* ep. 89. ap. *Lab.* col. 1396. (*m*) *Lab.* col. 1397. *Baron. An.* 445. pag. 31.

thority: Which will be more plain if we conſider, that the Emperor *Leo* in one of his Edicts ſaith, Conſtantinople *is the Mother of the Orthodox Religion of all Chriſtians*, with much more to this purpoſe (*n*); but *Baronius* relating this ſaith, *Thus indeed* Leo *ſpeaks thus, but without doubt it was conceived in the words, and writ in the Style of* Acacius *who ſwelled with Pride*: But *Leo* Biſhop of *Rome* was as proud as *Acacius*, and had more influence over *Valentinian*, than *Acacius* ever had over the Emperor *Leo*; wherefore in *Baronius* own words, *without doubt* Valentinian's *Edict was drawn up in Pope* Leo's *Style, and ſo he is only a Witneſs in his own Cauſe.* Thirdly, The Sentence of both the Emperor and the Pope was unjuſt; and although *Leo* wheedled the Biſhops of *France* to reject *Hilary*, that Biſhop ſtill acted as Primate, and called Synods afterwards; ſo that this big-ſpeaking Edict was neither believed nor obeyed as *de Marca* ſhews (*o*). For indeed *Hilary* was Primate by Original right, and the French Biſhops ſtuck to him not only for his great Sanctity, but becauſe they feared the then growing Encroachments and Uſurpations of *Rome*: And finally Pope *Hilary*, *Leo*'s Succeſſor determined this Controverſie, contrary to *Leo*'s Decree (*p*); by which we ſee how odly Cauſes go at *Rome*, ſince ſome Popes were for the Primacy of *Arles* and ſome againſt it: But when there was a ſtout Biſhop there, he kept his Poſt without regard to the Roman Sentence: And now I hope the Reader will ſmile at *Baronius* his inference from this Edict of *Valentinian*'s, *Thou ſeeſt clearly from hence* (ſaith he) *the Pope of* Romes *Authority over all Churches* (*q*), for he muſt be quick-ſighted indeed, who can ſee any more in this inſtance than an unjuſt and ineffective Claim.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 472. pag 294. Vid. item *An.* 458. pag. 233.

(*o*) P. de *Marca* de concord. lib. 5. cap. 33, & 34 pag. 98, &c.

(*p*) Vid. *Hilar.* ep. 11. *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 1. pag. 430.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 445. pag. 32.

An. Dom. 447. §. 5. Soon after Pope *Leo* had an opportunity to encroach upon the Churches of *Spain*; for one *Turibius* a Biſhop there, who is called *Leo*'s Notary, (and probably had been bread a Notary at *Rome*,) certifies the Pope that there were many Priſcillian Hereticks there, who confirmed

confirmed their Errors by certain Apocryphal Writings full of Blaſphemies; *Leo* writes back to *Turibius* (*r*), adviſing him to get a Council of all the Biſhops in *Spain*, and there to Condemn the Hereticks and their Apocryphal Books: This advice *Baronius* calls his enjoyning a *general Council* (more Majorum) *this being the right of the Pope of* Rome. And though he confeſſes the Biſhops did not meet where the Pope adviſed, nor could they meet in one place, becauſe they were under divers Kings, and thoſe *Arians*; yet he deſires us to obſerve from hence, *how weighty the Popes Authority was, even with Barbarous and Arian Kings* (*s*). But alas any one may ſee, he cannot make out that ever theſe Kings gave leave for any Council, and it is more probable theſe Biſhops met privately on this occaſion; yet they have made out of this, *A General Council of* Spain (*t*): And here they would have that rule of Faith firſt received from *Leo* and approved, which is printed before, in the firſt Council of *Toledo* (*u*): And *Baronius* ſaith the word [*Filioque*] *proceeding from the Father and the Son*, was firſt added in this Council to the Creed, by the Authority of Pope *Leo*, and brags much of the Popes ſupremacy, even in matters of Faith on this occaſion (*w*). But firſt theſe words were put in by theſe Councils, to check and diſcover Priſcillian Hereticks, not by any expreſs order of the Pope; and indeed *Leo* had been an ill Man, if he had impoſed an Article of Faith upon the Churches of *Spain*, which (as *Baronius* confeſſes,) was not received expreſly at *Rome* till many Ages after. Secondly, Theſe Spaniſh Biſhops did not add theſe words to the ancient Creed, but put them in by way of Explication, into an Occaſional Confeſſion of their own Compoſing. Thirdly, *Baronius* himſelf notes, that the Spaniards and French afterwards added it to their uſual Creeds, and at laſt *Rome* took this Addition from them: And in the ſame place he commends the *Northern* Nations for adding theſe words, and thoſe of *Rome* for rejecting them a long time; ſo that contradictory Actions may be (it

(*r*) *Leon.* ep. 93. ap. *Lab.* col. 1410.

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 447. pag. 46, 47.

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 503 *Lab.* col. 1465.

(*u*) *Bin.* Par. 1. pag. 599. ut ſupr.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 447. pag. 47, & 48.

ſeems) equally commended, by thoſe who can blow Hot and Cold with the ſame Breath.

About this time was held a great Council at *Verulam* in *Britain*, by St. *Garmanus* a French Biſhop, called over by the Orthodox Britains to aſſiſt them, in confuting and condemning the Pelagian Hereſy, as *Math.* of *Weſtminſter* computes (*x*). *Baronius* indeed pretends this hapned divers years before, only becauſe *Proſper* (or ſome who have ſince corrupted his Chronicle) affirms, that Pope *Celeſtine* ſent St. *Germanus* hither (*y*). But moſt Hiſtorians agree, the French Biſhops from a Council of their own, ſent over this aſſiſtance to the Britiſh Church the firſt time, without any order from *Celeſtine*; and this Council of *Verulam* (*z*) was held long after *Celeſtine*'s death, at St. *Germans* ſecond coming hither: So that in this Iſland, the Roman Church was not conſidered in thoſe days; and one Siſter Church deſired help of another to repreſs Hereſies, without any recourſe to *Rome*.

(*x*) *Lab.* col. 1464. *Spelm.* Concil. Tom. 1. pag. 47.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 429.

(*z*) *Uſſherij* Brit. Eccleſ. Antiqu. pag. 174.

An. Dom. 448. §. 6. In a Synod held at *Conſtantinople* under *Flavianus*, *Eutyches* a Monk was formally accuſed of Hereſy, for affirming that Chriſt had but one Nature after his Incarnation, and that it was as much Neſtorianiſm to hold two Natures as two Perſons; Upon which he was three ſeveral times cited before the Council, and had ſufficient time given, but refuſing to come till the time was expired, and (though he did come at laſt) obſtinately defending his Hereſy, he was unanimouſly condemned, and by *Flavianus* and the whole Synod Excommunicated and Degraded, which was a judicial proceeding agreeable to the ancient Canons. *Binius* and *Baronius* in relating this (*a*), make ſome remarks which muſt be conſidered: For firſt, when *Eutyches* ſaith, *He would ſubſcribe the Nicene and Epheſine Councils, ſo far as they were agreeable to Scripture*; They note this was (*more Hæreticorum*) *according to the manner of Hereticks*: But I would ask Firſt, Whether it be not true, that the Decrees of Councils in matters of Faith, are

(*a*) *Bin.* pag. 504. *Lab.* col. 1467. *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 55.

no

no further obligatory than they are proved by Scripture? Secondly, Whether the moſt Orthodox Fathers *Athanaſius*, *Cyril*, *&c.* did not always appeal to Scripture in the firſt place? And the greateſt Councils ever confirm their determinations firſt by Scripture? Thirdly, Whether any of the Adverſaries of *Eutyches* in that Age did cenſure him, for appealing firſt to Scripture? *Baronius* himſelf cites *Flavianus* his Letter, wherein he firſt alledges Scripture, and then the Expoſitions of the Fathers (*b*). And Pope *Leo* ſaith *Eutyches* erred, *by not having recourſe to the Prophets, Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, but to himſelf* (*c*); ſo that it was no fault in *Eutyches* to prefer Scripture before the Fathers expoſitions; nor to appeal to it; but to expound it wrongfully was his Crime, and that is (*more Hæreticorum.*) Secondly, When *Eutyches* petitioned *Theodoſius* in this caſe, for a ſafe conduct to the Synod, *Binius* adds to his Authors words, that this was alſo *after the manner of Hereticks*: Whereas it appears, that divers of the Orthodox have applied themſelves to the Emperors to aſſiſt and ſupport them, and none oftner than Pope *Leo* himſelf; ſo that a thing done as frequently by the Orthodox as Hereticks, can be no ſign or mark of Hereſy. Thirdly, *Binius* pretends, that Eutyches *appealed from this Synod to Pope* Leo: Now this is confuted by the very Acts of the Synod, related in the Council of *Chalcedon*, and recited by *Baronius*, where it is ſaid, Eutyches *appealed to the Council of the Roman Biſhop, and of the Biſhops of* Alexandria, Hieruſalem *and* Theſſalonica (*d*); yet they make as if this had been an Appeal only to the Pope. Fourthly, *Binius* notes, *the Appeal was not admitted*: I reply, Pope *Leo* did ſo far receive *Eutyches* Letter, that he writ three Epiſtles on his behalf, before he was informed of the true State of the Caſe, and quarrelled with *Flavianus* for condemning a convicted Heretick, before he had conſulted him (*e*). But in truth there was no Appeal at all: *Flavianus* did write indeed to *Leo*, (and probably to all other Patriarchs) after the Canonical Judgment was over, to acquaint them with his

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 76.

(*c*) Ep. x. *Leon.* M. ad *Flav.* inter ep. *Leon.* pag. 304.

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 75.

(*e*) *Leon.* Ep. 6, 7, & 8.

his proceedings; that ſo they might not break the Canons, by admitting an Heretick in one Church, who was Excommunicated in another: But the Style of *Flavianus* his Letter ſhews, that he need not ask *Leo*'s leave to cenſure an Heretical Prieſt of his own Dioceſs, nor doth he deſire the Pope to confirm his Sentence, but only to make it known (*f*): So that *Baronius* falſly infers the Popes power to judge of Hereſy, and confirm all Sentences againſt them, from this Letter of *Flavianus*: And he as falſly makes the like inference from *Eutyches* writing to *Leo*, as if *he knew of what weight the Popes judgment was, for which Councils in doubtful Caſes uſe to ſtay, and to which all the Catholick Church would certainly incline* (*g*). For *Eutyches* writ to other Biſhops of *Italy* as well as the Pope, (as *Baronius* in that Page confeſſeth) and conſidered *Leo* no otherwiſe than as one Eminent Biſhop: And this Synod of *Conſtantinople* ſtayed not for the Popes Judgment, nor did thoſe Biſhops who deſpiſed the Decree of this Synod, value Pope *Leo*'s Judgment after he had declared for *Flavianus*: So little truth is there in the Annaliſts pompous obſervations, which only ſhew, that all his aim is from every paſſage, to extort ſome kind of colour for his dear Supremacy.

(*f*) Epiſt. *Flavian.* ad *Leon.* inter Epiſt. *Leon.* pag. 298.

(*g*) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 63.

In the ſame year were two Synods, one at *Tyre*, the other at *Berithus*, in the cauſe of one *Ibas* a Syrian Biſhop, wherein the Patriarch of *Antioch* and *Conſtantinople* were concerned; but the Pope is not once mentioned in the whole proceedings (*h*); But of the Cauſe it ſelf, we ſhall hear more afterward.

(*h*) *Bin.* pag. 505. *Lab.* col. 1468, &c. *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 64.

Theodoſius the Emperor being deceived by *Eutyches* and *Chryſapius*, one of his great Courtiers, an *Eunuch*, eſpouſes the Quarrel of that Heretick, and labours to have the Sentence which *Flavianus* paſſed againſt him in the late Synod, revoked; and Pope *Leo* was drawn into the ſame ſnare by the Letters of *Eutyches* and *Theodoſius*, till *Flavianus* had better informed him: For *Leo* writ both to the Emperor and *Flavianus* on *Eutyches* behalf at firſt: And whereas *Baronius* ought

An. Dom. 449.

to

to bluſh for the Popes miſtake, he recites theſe two Letters, and talks big of his being owned for *the lawful and chief Judge in Eccleſiaſtil Controverſies*; yea the ſupreme Judge of *the Univerſal Church*, &c. (*i*) But though (as an ingenuous Romaniſt obſerves,) Leo *in all his Epiſtles boaſts of the power of his Apoſtolical Seat, as much as he can, and more than by the Canons he ought to do* (*k*); yet neither of theſe Epiſtles ſay any ſuch thing, as *Baronius* infers from them. And that Letter of *Flavianus*, which delivered this infallible Judge from his miſtake, declares that Eutyches *had received a juſt and Canonical Condemnation, to which the Pope ought to conſent, and to joyn in it*: By which we ſee a Sentence againſt an Heretick was juſt, before the Pope knew of it, and that he and all Orthodox Biſhops, ought by their ſubſequent conſents to ratifie what any one Biſhop had Canonically done: And ſince *Eutyches* was already rightly cenſured, *Flavianus* requires *Leo* (and no doubt other Eminent Biſhops) to publiſh their conſent to it, thereby to prevent the deſign of *Eutyches*, which was to get a general Council called, to judge his Cauſe over again: Now this ſerves *Baronius* to brag, *that* Flavianus *knew there was no need of a general Council, for that which the Popes Letters had defined* *A ſtrange affection! For when Pope *Leo*, not *firſt* (as *Baronius* ſaith falſly) but *laſt* of all the Orthodox Biſhops did ſtand up for *Flavianus*, and write to confirm his Cenſure upon *Eutyches*, that very Cauſe was tried over again in the Pſeudo-general Council of *Epheſus*, and the true Oecumenical Council of *Chalcedon*: Yea, *Theodoſius* while the matter lay before the Pope, not ſtaying for his Sentence, calleth a ſecond Council at *Conſtantinople*, wherein a pacted party of Hereticks Friends revoked the Judgment paſſed on him by *Flavianus* (*l*). And yet fearing this was not ſufficient, *Eutiches* moved by *Dioſcorus*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, to have a general Council called at *Epheſus*, which might have ſufficient Authority, not only to reſtore *Eutyches*, but to Condemn *Flavianus*, though *Leo* ſhould take his part.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 72, 73.

(*k*) *Richer.* Hiſtor. Concil. Cien. cap. 8. §. 2. pag. 335.

* Vid. *Richer.* ibid. pag. 336.

(*l*) *Bin.* pag. 505. *Lab.* col. 1470. *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 74.

§. 7. This

The 2d Pſeudo-Synod of Epheſus.

§. 7. This was the true occaſion of calling this Second Council of *Epheſus*, which as to the manner of calling, the Perſons preſent, *&c.* was a General Council. But from the violent and unjuſt proceedings thereof, is commonly ſtiled *The Pſeudo-Synod*, or the *Thieviſh Council of* Epheſus. The Acts of this Council are recited at large in the Council of *Chalcedon*; wherefore the Editors refer us thither, only entertaining us here with *Binius* his Notes, on which we will make ſome remarks (*m*). *Firſt*, The Notes ſay, *the Emperor called this General Council, uſurping the Popes Authority againſt right and the cuſtom of the Church.* Now here he firſt owns that the Emperor called it: As to the pretended uſurpation and breach of Cuſtom, it is certain the Pope never yet had called one General Council, as we have particularly ſhewn in three General Councils before, and they own it here; ſo that undoubtedly the Emperor only followed the Cuſtom of the Church, and uſed that Right which his Anceſtors had. Beſides, let *Binius* or *Baronius* produce one ſyllable in all *Leo*'s Epiſtles, where that Pope (ſo jealous of his Rights) did once complain of any injury done him by the Emperor in calling this Synod: His Legate owns in this very Council, that the Pope had received ſuch a Letter of Summons as the reſt of the Patriarchs did receive (*n*); and he obeyed this Summons, and ſent his Legates thither, excuſing his own abſence, without any reflection upon the Emperors having no Right to Summon him: Yea, had he known it was his Right to call a General Council, why did he write ſo many Letters to *Theodoſius* and to *Pulcherius, humbly beſeeching the Emperor to call a General Council in* Italy (*o*)? Nothing can be clearer, than that this pretence of Uſurpation is a moſt notorious Falſhood. *Secondly*, The Notes blame the Emperor for making *Dioſcorus* Preſident of this Council; and *Baronius* calls this *arrogating and uſurping a Right never attempted before*, and he thinks *God juſtly deprived* Theodoſius *of his Life the year after, for his wronging*

(m) *Bin.* pag. 506. *Lab.* col. 1471.

(n) *Richer.* Hiſt. Concil. Gen. Tom. 1. c. 8. §. 4. p. 340.

(o) *Richer.* ib. p. 350.

wronging the Pope herein (*p*). But we have ſhewed, *Oſius* was the Emperors Legate, and by him made Preſident of the Council at *Nice*, and *Cyril* was by the Emperor made Preſident in that of *Epheſus* : As for this Council, the Pope was not like to be there in Perſon. *Flavianus*, who ſhould have had the ſecond place, was a Party, whoſe Sentence was to be enquired into; *Domnus*, of *Antioch*, was not altogether unſuſpected; but *Eutyches* friends had commended *Dioſcorus*, of *Alexandria*, and *Juvenalis*, of *Hieruſalem*, to the Emperor as impartial and fit to Judge; and their Characters made them (as the Caſe was ſuppoſed to ſtand) to have right to that (*q*). 'Tis true the Popes Legates did murmur at this, as *Liberatus* ſaith (*r*), and the Legates at *Chalcedon* called this a uſurpation in *Dioſcorus*; but neither this Council nor that did inſiſt upon that matter. *Thirdly*, The Notes pretend *Theodoſius* therefore ſummoned *Leo* to this Council, *becauſe he knew the Council would be null without the Popes Authority*. But the Letter of Summons declares he called it by his own Authority, and he writ no other Summons to *Leo* than he did to the Biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Jeruſalem*; ſo that it may as well be ſaid, *Theodoſius* knew their Authority was as neceſſary as the Popes; but the truth is, the conſent of the great Patriarchs was ſo far neceſſary, that they were to be duly ſummoned, and if poſſible, to be preſent; but they had no Authority ſingle, as to the calling or diſannulling of any Council. Wherefore, *Fourthly*, Though it be rejected, yet not becauſe the Pope did not call it, or preſide in it (as his Notes pretend) but becauſe of the unjuſt and violent proceedings uſed in it; againſt which, not only the Popes Legates, but divers other Biſhops did proteſt, and oppoſe them, even to the ſuffering of Baniſhment and Deprivation. And here I muſt note a manifeſt contradiction in *Baronius*, who in one page ſaith, *All the Biſhops conſented to the reſtitution of* Eutyches, *and the depoſing of* Flavianus, *the Legates of the Apoſtolick See only oppoſing* Dioſcorus *to his face*: Yet in the next

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 78.

(*q*) Vid. *Richer.* Tom. 1. c. 8. §. 5. p. 246, &c.

(*r*) *Liberat.* brev. c. 12.

page he reckons up ſome Biſhops by name, who ſuffered for oppoſing *Dioſcorus*; and adds out of *Leo*'s Epiſtle to *Pulcheria*, *that many were deprived and baniſhed for this oppoſition, and others put in their places* (*s*). *Laſtly*, I only add, that the Emperor, being deceived by *Eutyches*, confirmed the Decrees of this Pſeudo-Synod, as his Anceſtors were wont to do (*t*); and for this reaſon the Acts of it were valid till they were diſannulled by the General Council of *Chalcedon*; and though the Pope diſliked and complained of this Council, he had no Authority to null all its Acts till another General Council was called: Wherefore that Third Roman Council, wherein *Leo* and the Biſhops of *Italy* reprobated the Acts of this Pſeudo-Synod of *Epheſus* (*u*), was not ſufficient to repeal the Council it ſelf, but only to ſhew that thoſe weſtern Biſhops would not receive it. For if the Popes Council alone had made it null, what need had their been of a General Council to do that over again? Yea, the Pope and this Roman Synod writ to the Emperor, earneſtly entreating him, *that all things might remain in the ſame State they were before any proceedings, till a General Council could meet* (*w*); which ſhews that they did not believe their ſingle Authority was ſufficient to annul all that was done†. After this Roman Council, it ſeems *Dioſcorus*, in his Private Council at *Alexandria*, excommunicated Pope *Leo*, and *Baronius* makes this a greater Crime than his confirming the Hereſie of *Eutyches*; and he (with the Notes) obſerve it as a wonder, that whereas Ninety Biſhops ſigned the Hereſie of *Eutyches*, only Ten could be found to ſubſcribe the Excommunication of the Pope (*x*); but the wonder ceaſes, if we conſider that *Eutyches* was reſtored in a General Council, or that which was called ſo, wherein there met an hundred twenty eight Biſhops, or their Deputies; but the Pope was excommunicated in a Private Synod at *Alexandria*. I ſhall not enlarge upon the cruel uſage of *Flavianus* in this Pſeudo-Synod of *Epheſus*, who died ſoon after of the blows and wounds given him there, nor

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 95. cum pag. 96.

(*t*) *Baron.* ib. pag. 104.

(*u*) *Bin.* pag. 507. *Lab.* col. 1475.

(*w*) Vid. *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 109.

† *The Emperor was deſired to diſannul this Synod, by the Pope,* &c. Concil. Chalced. Act. 10. *Bin.* p. 294, &c.

(*x*) *Bin.* in predict. Concil. 3. Rom. p. 508. *Lab.* ut ſupr. *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 113.

nor remark how *Baronius* would make him a Martyr for the Popes Supremacy(*y*), whereas he was a Martyr for the Orthodox Faith, corrupted by *Eutyches*: Nor ſhall I detain the Reader with any of his odd obſervations upon the flight of *Hilary*, one of the Popes Legates, from this Council.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 97.

Anatolius, being by *Dioſcorus* advanced to the See of *Conſtantinople*, in the room of *Flavianus*, *Leo* had great reaſon to fear he was infected with the Hereſie of *Eutyches*, and therefore he very carefully ſent three Legates to *Conſtantinople*, to inform him whether *Anatolius* were Orthodox, and to deſire a General Council might be called by the Emperor, and in *Italy*, if he pleaſed, as his Letter imports (*z*); in the mean time (if we may truſt the Acts of one of theſe Legates coming out of the Vatican) *Anatolius* calls a Council at *Conſtantinople*, and in the preſence of the Popes Legates owns himſelf Orthodox, receives Pope *Leo*'s Letter to *Flavianus*, and condemns *Eutyches* and *Neſtorius*; and this the Editors publiſh with the Title of *a Council at* Conſtantinople (*a*). Now though their own Author of the Vatican expreſly ſays, that *Anatolius called this Council*; yet both *Baronius*, and the Notes in the ſame page daringly affirm, that *the Popes Legates commanded all the neighbouring Biſhops to meet in this Council* (*b*): Which is as falſe, as that theſe Legates were ſent to reſtore the lapſed Oriental Church; and that both *Theodoſius* and *Anatolius*, and all the Eaſtern Biſhops, in all theſe Tranſactions, owned the Pope to be the Supream Head of the Church. Theſe things are only to be found in *Baronius* his Inferences, but no Author or Record of theſe proceedings hint any ſuch thing. The Legates chief buſineſs was to petition the Emperor for a General Council; and it was uſual when any new Patriarch was advanced, that he ſhould write an account of his Faith to all the other Patriarchs; and *Anatolius* having been juſtly ſuſpected, was obliged to do it ſomething more ſolemnly, for *Leo*'s ſatisfaction.

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 450. pag. 115.

(*a*) *Bin.* pag. 508. *Lab.* col. 1475.

(*b*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* ut ſupr. *Baron. An.* 450. pag. 120.

CHAP. III.

Of the Council of Chalcedon, *being the Fourth General Council.*

An. Dom. 451. §. 1. BEING to diſcourſe of the Fourth General Council at *Chalcedon*, we muſt obſerve, that beſides the partial Preface before it (*a*), and the falſacious Notes after it (*b*), publiſhed by the Editors, the Acts of it are divided into three parts. The firſt containing the Epiſtles, and other Writings precedent to the Council. The ſecond containing the ſeveral Acts of it. The third containing the Epiſtles, and other Tranſcripts relating to that Council afterwards. Of the firſt part I ſhall treat very briefly, having ſpoken of divers things, there collected, in the former Chapter; only noting now ſome of the Frauds and Errors in theſe preliminary Epiſtles. And firſt, I need not enlarge upon thoſe falſe Stories in the Preface to this Council, (which I confuted before, *Anno* 448, and *Anno* 449.) *That* Eutyches *appealed from* Flavian's *Council at* Conſtantinople, *to the Pope*; *That the Pope immediately became an Enemy to that Heretick*; *That it was the higheſt Crime in* Eutyches *to appeal from the Pope to the Emperor* (*c*). Nor will it be neceſſary to inſiſt upon the Prefacers owning that *Theodoſius* called the Pſeudo-Synod of *Epheſus*, at *Dioſcorus* his requeſt; and though Pope *Leo* did labour to hinder it, yet he durſt not but ſend his Legates to it, who indeed did generouſly refuſe to joyn in the condemnation of *Flavianus*: But whereas the Prefacer pretends *Flavianus appealed to the Apoſtolick See* (*d*) (as if the Pope were alone fit to receive Appeals), I muſt note, *Firſt*, That *de Marca* confeſſes All the reſt of the Patriarchs were his open Enemies, and there-

(*a*) *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 1. p. 2. *Lab.* Tom. 4. p. 1.

(*b*) *Bin.* ib. pag. 409. *Lab.* col. 979.

(*c*) *Bin.* Pref. pag. 3. *Lab.* col. 3, & 4.

(*d*) *Bin.* Pref. pag. 3. *Lab.* ib. col. 5.

therefore he was compelled to apply to the Weſtern Church for help (*e*), and yet he did not Appeal to the Pope alone; and *Leo* told *Placidia*, that *Flavianus* Appealed not only to the Apoſtolick Throne, but to all the Biſhops of thoſe parts (*f*); and *Leo* ſaith the ſame thing in his own Epiſtles, that the Appeal was *to all the Churches of thoſe parts* (*g*); and therefore all the Weſtern Biſhops joyned with *Leo* in deſiring a Council might be held in *Italy*: Which was when they were met in Council at *Rome*, and had (no doubt) declared their diſlike of *Dioſcorus*'s proceedings; but it ſufficiently confutes the Prefacers boaſt of *Leo* and his Councils reſcinding the Acts of this Epheſine Pſeudo-Synod, as if that had been ſufficient to null all that was done there; becauſe if the Pope, in that Council of *Rome*, had ſufficient Authority to have abrogated the Acts of *Epheſus*, there was no need for them to deſire a greater Council to re-examine this matter, or for *Leo* (as the Preface owns) to engage the Weſtern Emperor, his Mother and his Empreſs to write to *Theodoſius*, to ſuffer the Tranſactions at *Epheſus* to be heard over again (*h*). But *Theodoſius* having called that Synod by his own Authority, and being perſuaded by *Eutyches* his Party, that the proceedings in it were regular, would not be prevailed on by any importunities to grant this requeſt; but he dying ſoon after, and *Marcian* (by marrying *Pulcheria*, Siſter and Heir to *Theodoſius*) coming to be Emperor, conſented to call a General Council, but not (as the Pope deſired) in *Italy*, but in the *Eaſt*, where the Controverſie began, and where by the Ancient Canons it was to be decided. Which ſuffices to diſcover all thoſe falſhoods that are in that part of the Preface, which concerns the things before this General Council.

(*e*) *De Marca* de concord. l. 7. c. 7. p. 324.

(*f*) Concil. Chalced. par. 1. *Bin.* p. 24. *Lab.* col. 54.

(*g*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 19. *Lab.* col. 42.

(*h*) *Bin.* pag. 4. *Lab.* col. 6.

In the Preleminary Epiſtles and Edicts which conſtitute the firſt part of the Council of *Chalcedon*, we may obſerve many of the Titles of the Epiſtles are corrupted by Roman Paraſites. So in the firſt Epiſtle of *Flavianus* (*i*) the true reading is, *to* Leo *Arch-Biſhop of*

(*i*) Vid. *Lab.* num. 4. col. 15. marg. ita num. 6. *Bin.* p. 8. *Lab.* col. 18.

of the elder Rome; but they have made it *Pope*, &c. In *Flavians* ſecond Epiſtle to *Leo*, the Latin Copies leave out of the Title, *and Fellow-miniſter* (*k*): So again [*Pope*] is put into the Latin Copy inſtead of Arch-Biſhop in a Letter of *Leo*'s to the Monks at *Conſtantinople* (*l*). And in *Leo*'s Epiſtle to *Theodoſius*, in the Latin (for *Leo*, Biſhop) there is put in theſe abſurd words, *Leo, Pope of the Catholick Church of the City of* Rome (*m*). And in his Epiſtle to the ſecond Synod at *Epheſus*, the Latin leaves out theſe Material Expreſſions, *to his beloved Brethren in the Lord greeting* (*n*). To conclude, the Greek Title owns that *Leo* and his Roman Synod *petitioned for a Council in* Italy; the Latin leaves this out, though the body of the Letter do expreſly declare that requeſt (*o*) Now theſe are plain Inſtances how little Credit is to be given to the Latin Copies of this Council, and eſpecially to theſe Titles, which the Popes Flatterers have frequently corrupted, and altered them from the modeſt Style uſed in thoſe days. And hence we may gather how frivolouſly *Baronius* argues from the Titles of Pope *Leo*'s Epiſtles, wherein he ſtiles himſelf *Biſhop of the Roman and of the Univerſal Church* (*p*); that the Popes then did uſe the ſtyle of *Univerſal Biſhop*; though St. *Gregory* expreſly denies that ever any of his Predeceſſors uſed that profane, new and proud Title; but the Annaliſt makes bold to give *Gregory* the *Lie*, meerly on the credit of theſe corrupted and fictitious Titles, prefixed by forging Paraſites; for *Leo*'s uſual Inſcription was, *Leo, the Biſhop of* Rome, *to*, &c. ſo that where we ſee *Biſhop or Pope of the Catholick Church of* Rome, *&c.* (*q*), there 'tis certain the Flatterers have been at work. But as to more material obſervations; when *Flavianus* had condemned *Eutyches*, he doth not deſire the Pope to confirm the Sentence, which being regularly paſſed on him by his own Biſhop in Council, no man could relax (as *Leo* himſelf grants (*r*)): But his Letter to *Leo* requires him to publiſh it to all the Biſhops under his juriſdiction (*s*). In *Leo*'s Epiſtle to *Julian*, one of his Legates, the Latin Copy puts in [*nobis*,] and

(*k*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* num. 6.

(*l*) *Bin* pag. 12. *Lab.* col. 23. num. 9.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 12. *Lab.* col. 26. num. 10.

(*n*) *Bin.* pag. 15. *Lab.* col. 31. num. 13.

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 18. *Lab.* col. 37, 38. num. 19.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 159. *Leon.* ep. 54. in Concil. Chalced. par. 3. *Bin.* p. 355. num. 6.

(*q*) *Leon.* ep. 12, & 13. Concil. Chal. par. 1. *Bin.* p. 12, & 14.

(*r*) *Leo* ep. ad *Pulcher. Bin.* p. 13. *Lab.* col. 27. num. 11.

(*s*) *Flav.* ep. ad *Leon.* num. 6. *Bin.* p. 9. *Lab.* col. 19.

and makes *Leo* ſay *there is one Doctrine and Teaching of the Holy Ghoſt, in us and in you*; but the Greek reads —— *in the whole Catholick Church* (*t*). Again, it is commonly pretended that Pope *Leo* was utterly againſt the Emperors calling the ſecond Council at *Epheſus*; and that one reaſon which made all its proceedings null, was becauſe it was called without his conſent: But it appears by divers of this Popes Letters here publiſhed, that he owned it *a pious Reſolution of the Emperor to call this Council* (*u*), and in obſervance of his Commands, he ſent his Legates to it: So that he never pleaded his Authority in bar to the Emperors Right, even when in his Judgment he thought there was no need of it (*w*). And he declares that he ſent theſe Legates, not to preſide there, but *to agree with them by common conſent on ſuch things as might be pleaſing to God*, as his Letter to this Synod ſhews, Num. 13.

(*t*) Ep. *Leon.* ad *Jul.* num. 8. *Bin.* p. 10. *Lab.* col. 19.

(*u*) Ep. *Le.* ad *Theod.* n. 10. *Bin.* p. 10. *Lab.* col. 26. ita in ep. ad *Pulcher.* num. 11. ep. ad Synod. Epheſ. num. 13.

(*w*) Ep. *Leon.* ibid. num. 16, & 17. *Bin.* p. 17. *Lab.* col. 37.

It appears by *Petrus Chryſologus*, Biſhop of *Ravenna*'s Letter to *Eutyches*, that he appealed to him as well as to the Pope; for he excuſes himſelf as unfit to judge a Cauſe that had been tried in a far Country, eſpecially upon hearing only one Party (*x*): A Rule, which if the Popes had duly obſerved, they would not have received ſo many unjuſt Appeals. 'Tis true, he refers him to Pope *Leo*'s Epiſtle to *Flavianus*, lately writ on this ſubject; but *Binius* in his Notes falſly puts in, that *he warns him to rely on it as an Oracle of the Holy Ghoſt* (*y*); for he only ſaith, there was now an Orthodox Pope in St. *Peter*'s Chair, who had taught the Faith aright in this Epiſtle, which had been ſent by *Leo*, a little before, to this and other Biſhops of the *Weſt*, for their approbation. But that of *Leo* himſelf in his Epiſtle to *Theodoſius*, ſhews he was no honeſter than he ſhould be, and deſerved not ſo good a Character as the Biſhop of *Ravenna* gives him; for he impudently cites one of the Sardican Canons, under the forged Title of *the Nicene Canon made by all the Biſhops in the World* (*z*); the Margin would excuſe this, by pretending that other Fathers cite theſe Sardican Canons under the Title of *Nicene Canons*;

(*x*) Ep. *Petr. Raven.* ad *Eutych.* num. 15. *Bin.* p. 17. *Lab.* col. 35.

(*y*) Not. in Concil. *Bin.* p. 415. *Lab.* col. 992.

(*z*) Ep. *Leon.* ad *Theod.* num. 19, 20. *Bin.* pag. 19, 20. *Lab.* col. 42, & 46.

Canons; but we know no ancient Fathers did ſo, except *Zoſimus* and *Boniface* his Predeceſſors, who, to their laſting infamy, were convicted of this notorious Fraud in the Council of *Carthage*; and therefore it was an odd piece of aſſurance in *Leo*, ſo ſoon after, to make uſe of the ſame detected Cheat. In another Epiſtle of his againſt *Eutyches*, he ſaith, *In the myſtical diſtribution of the ſpiritual Food, that is given and received, by which thoſe who partake of the virtue of the Heavenly Food, are changed into his Fleſh, who was made our Fleſh* (*a*), which is point blank againſt their modern Opinion of Tranſubſtantiation, making the Bread to be Spiritual and Heavenly Food, and the change to be not in the Elements, but in the Receivers. After this we have divers Epiſtles of the Weſtern Emperor *Valentinian*; of his Mother and Empreſs, to *Theodoſius* and *Pulcheria*, writ at the requeſt of Pope *Leo*, to deſire that Emperor to revoke the Judgment paſſed in the Pſeudo-Synod of *Epheſus*, which further proves the Pope had no Authority in himſelf to null thoſe Acts; for he would not have begged with Tears that which was in his own Power. But the great uſe the Romaniſts make of theſe Letters, is on account of ſome high Expreſſions in them about *the Popes having a Power over all Biſhops* (*b*), and a Principality among them (*c*). But there is ſome doubt whether theſe Epiſtles are genuine, the Story of their being at *Rome* the night after St. *Peter's* day, not agreeing to the time when theſe pretended Epiſtles muſt be writ: But if they be not forged, *Rome* will gain nothing by *theſe phraſes*, which *Leo* put into their Mouths; for he certainly endited theſe Letters for them, as we may know by this Evidence, that the Emperors Mother, *Galla Placidia* (who underſtood no more of the Canons than the Pope told her) *cites the Canon of* Sardica, for *a Canon of* Nice (*d*), as *Leo* had done before; and therefore *ex ungue Leonem*; we may eaſily know the Penman of theſe Epiſtles: Now when he bears witneſs only to himſelf, his teſtimony is ſuſpicious, and of no weight at all; and *Theodoſius* valued theſe

(*a*) Ep. *Leon.* ad *Conſt.* num. 23. *Bin.* p. 22. *Lab.* col. 48.

(*b*) Ep. *Valent.* num. 25. *Bin.* p. 23. *Lab.* col. 51.

(*c*) Num. 28. *Bin.* p. 25. *Lab.* col. 58.

(*d*) Ep. *Gal. Placid.* num. 26. *Bin.* p. 24. *Lab.* col. 54.

theſe brags ſo little, that he calls *Leo* only by the name of Patriarch in his anſwer, and affirms the Nicene Canons were not broken, and therefore he utterly rejected the requeſt (*e*). Yet *Leo* was forced to be content, and to receive *Anatolius* choſen Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, in this Synod of *Epheſus* into his Communion, only deſiring him to give an Account of his being Orthodox in the Faith, that he might publiſh it to other Biſhops (*f*); Soon after which *Theodoſius* died.

(*e*) Ep. *Theod.* num. 29, 30, 31. *Bin.* p. 25. *Lab.* col. 58, &c.

(*f*) Ep. *Leon.* ad *Theod.* Num. 32. *Bin.* pag. 32. *Lab.* col. 61.

Marcianus ſucceeding, and having no other Title to the Empire than his being married to *Pulcheria*, he remitted much of the Majeſty of Style in his Letters to *Leo* and other Biſhops, uſed by *Theodoſius* and other Emperors (*g*). But even when he complements the Pope in the higheſt ſtrain, he will not yield the Council ſhould be called in *Italy* as the Pope deſired, but reſolves to have it in the *Eaſt*, in ſome City which he himſelf ſhould chooſe (*b*): Where we may ſee a notorious Forgery in *Baronius* and *Binius*, for whereas the Emperor ſaith, *where it ſhall ſeem good to us*, *Baronius* turns *nobis*, into *vobis*, and *Binius* in his Notes follows him (*i*); as if the Emperor had left it to the Pope, to chooſe what City he pleaſed for the Council to meet; Nay further, *Binius* who reads it *nobis* in the Epiſtle, yet in a Note before that Letter, he ſaith it was *where the Peope pleaſed*; and hath the Confidence to ſay in his Notes at the end of the Council, that the Emperor writ to the Pope *to appoint the place, time and manner of calling this General Synod*: Than which nothing can be more falſe; for the Pope would have had it in the *Weſt* if he might have choſen, but the Emperor Summoned the Biſhops firſt to come to *Nice*, as his Letters yet extant ſhew (*k*); and thither the Popes firſt Letter to the Synod ought to be directed; and I wiſh that ignorant hand which altered the Title, and put in *Chalcedon* inſtead of *Nice*, hath not put in thoſe words in it, of *ſaving the honour of St.* Peter, *and of his Legates being ſent to preſide in the Council* (*l*), which paſſages might look favourably on the ſupremacy if they be genuine;

(*g*) *Richer.* Hiſt Concil. gen. l. 1 c. 8. §. 11. pag. 361.

(*b*) Epiſt. *Marcian.* ad *Leon.* Num. 34. *Bin.* pag. 28. *Lab.* col. 63.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 450. pag. 119. *Bin.* not. pag. 409. *Lab.* col. 980.

(*k*) Epiſt. *Marcian.* Num 36, & 37. *Bin.* pag. 29, &c. *Lab.* col. 66, &c.

(*l*) Epiſt *Leon.* ad *Synod* num. 40. *Bin.* pag. 31.

only they are no more but *Leo*'s own Evidence in his own Cauſe: After this the Council being aſſembled at *Nice*, they with the Popes Legates deſired the Emperors preſence among them, upon which he removed the Council to the City of *Chalcedon*, and thither he afterward came to them (*m*). On which I ſhall only note, that *Baronius* and *Binius* have turned this Petition of the Council and Legates, into a Declaration of the Legates alone; for they pretend that the Emperor writ to the Council, *That it ſeemed good to the Popes Legates that he ſhould be preſent* (*n*); Which is a falſe repreſentation of the matter, as the Emperors Letter ſhews.

(*m*) Epiſt. *Marcian.* Num. 41. *Bin.* pag. 32. *Lab.* col. 74.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 132. *Bin.* not. pag. 409. *Lab.* col. 980.

§. 2. We proceed now to the Council it ſelf aſſembled at *Chalcedon*, and will firſt conſider theſe generals, *viz.* 1*ſt*. Who called it. 2*ly*. Who preſided in it, and in what Order they ſate. 3*ly*. Who confirmed the Acts of it: And ſecondly make ſome brief remarks on the particular Acts of this Council.

Firſt, As to the Authority by which it was convened; Though the Preface had owned that *Marcian* called this Council (*o*), yet the Notes affirm, *it was appointed by the Authority of* Leo, *and by the advice, aſſiſtance and help of* Marcian *congregated*: And again, *it is clear this General Council was convened by the Exhortation and Counſel of the Emperor, but by the Command and Authority of the Pope* (*p*): And this they pretend to prove by the Epiſtle of the Biſhops of *Mæſia*, writ ſome years after the Council, which they cite thus, *Many holy Biſhops meeting in the City of Chalcedon*, by the Command of *Leo* (who is truly an head of Biſhops;) but the Epiſtle adds——*and of the venerable Biſhop and Patriarch* Anatolius *a Council was held, which was confirmed under two Emperors* (*q*). But theſe fraudulent Editors leave out theſe laſt words, which ſhew that theſe Biſhops were as much called by the Authority of *Anatolius* as of *Leo*, and alſo that the Emperors confirmed the Acts of this general Council, which two things *Binius* would con-

(*o*) Præf. *Bin.* pag. 4 *Lab.* p. 6.

(*p*) Not. *Bin.* pag. 409. *Lab.* col. 980.

(*q*) Concil. *Chalced.* par. 3. Num. 32. *Bin.* pag. 381. *Lab.* col. 912.

conceal from his Reader: Now this accidental expreſſion of ſix Biſhops long after, implying no more but only that *Leo* and *Anatolius* ſent out the Emperors Summons to all Biſhops,(the other three Patriarchs being not then of unſuſpected fame,) is all they have to prove this egregious falſhood of this Councils being called by the Popes ſole Authority, except an Epiſtle of *Gelaſius*, another Pope pleading his own Cauſe: Whereas there are clear and expreſs proofs almoſt innumerable, that it was appointed and convened or called by the Emperors Authority: For *Leo* was ſummoned himſelf by the Emperor, and in obedience to that Summons excuſes his own abſence, and ſends his Legates to the Council (*r*). And the Emperors general Letter, ſtrictly requiring all Biſhops to be there is extant (*s*), a Copy of which probably was delivered to the Pope: And in the beginning of every Act it is expreſly ſaid, *The Synod met* (κληθὲν — κληθὲν θείου διατάγματος &c.) *by the command, or divine Authority of the Emperors* (*t*); and it is ſo often repeated, that this Council was called by the precept or command of the Emperor, as makes it needleſs and impoſſible to cite all the places: *Liberatus* the Deacon who writ ſome years after (when the Popes had encroached ſomething further) ſaith, *at the Popes requeſt the Emperor commanded this Council to be aſſembled* (*u*); which makes it a ſtrange boldneſs in *Baronius* to affirm, *that the Emperor requeſted the Pope that a Council might be called* (*w*), which not only this Hiſtorian but the Emperors Letter in the next page contradicts: Yea *Leo* himſelf in his 61*ſt* Epiſtle, which the Notes cite with great applauſe owns, *the Council was gathered by the precept of the moſt Chriſtian Princes, &c.* (*x*) and the Pope in divers of his Epiſtles, owns the Authority of calling general Councils to be in the Emperor; yea the Legates own in the very Council it ſelf, that the Council was ſummoned by the Emperors Authority: So that for any of the Popes flatterers to pretend the contrary, is to wink againſt the cleareſt light.

(*r*) Epiſt. *Leon.* Num. 40. *Bin.* p. 31. *Lab.* col. 70.

(*s*) Epiſt. *Marcian.* Num. 36. *Bin.* pag. 29. *Lab.* col. 66.

(*t*) Concil. *Chalced.* Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 34. *Lab.* col. 78, &c.

(*u*) Liberat. Brev. cap. 13.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 126.

(*x*) Not. *Bin.* p. 185. *Lab.* col. 410. 982.

Secondly, As to the Preſidents of this Council, the Hiſtorical Preface is very poſitive, *that the Apoſtolical Legates preſided* (*y*); and the Notes prove it was a general Council, *becauſe the Pope preſided by his Legates* (*z*). But if that were eſſential to a General Council, there was none before this of *Chalcedon:* Here indeed three of the five Legates named by the Pope, *Paſchaſinus*, *Lucentius* and *Boniface*, were allowed to ſit uppermoſt on one ſide of the Biſhops, but *Baſilius* and *Julianus*, the other two, who alſo were named Legates by the Pope, were not owned by the Council under that Character, and therefore had no precedency given them (*a*). And if this be all they mean by the Legates preſiding, that they in right of the Pope had the firſt place among the Biſhops, we will not contend with them; but if they ſuppoſe any Power or Authority theſe Legates had over the Council by this precedency, we muſt deny that. *Baronius* brags that all things were determined by the Popes Authority (*b*). And the Notes before cited, ſpeak as if they had done all things in this Council (*c*); yea, the Latin verſion of the Council forgets the Title of *Preſidents*, thrice, and claps it to the names of theſe Legates (*d*), which Title is not in the Greek: But if we examine into the matter, theſe three Legates who were allowed by the Council, had nothing more than the honour of ſitting uppermoſt upon the left hand, and ſometimes ſpeaking and ſubſcribing firſt: But in the twelfth Act concerning the Church of *Epheſus*, over which the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* claimed ſome Juriſdiction, *Anatolius* ſpeaks before the Popes Legate, and by his direction the matter was determined (*e*). And though both *Baronius* and the Notes boaſt, *That the Legates pronounced the ſentence on* Dioſcorus *in the Popes name, as Preſidents of the Council* (*f*); Yet if we conſult the place we ſhall find, that they twice asked the Synods Opinion of *Dioſcorus* his Caſe, and the whole Synod declared he was to be condemned; yet the Legates durſt not pronounce the Sentence, till they asked *if the Synod commanded them to give the* Ec-

(*y*) Præf. *Bin.* pag. 4. *Lab.* col. 6.
(*z*) Not in Concil. *Bin.* pag. 410. *Lab.* col. 981.
(*a*) Not. *Bin.* pag. 411. *Lab.* col. 984.
(*b*) *Baron. An.* 450. pag. 120.
(*c*) Not. in Concil. *Bin.* pag. 410. *Lab.* col. 981.
(*d*) Act. 3. *Bin.* pag. 174. *Lab.* col. 380. ibid. in ſubſcrip. Act. 3. *Bin.* pag. 208. *Lab.* col. 448. Et ſubſcrip. Act. 4. *Bin.* pag. 259. *Lab.* col. 580.
(*e*) Act. 12. *Bin.* pag. 305. *Lab.* col. 771.
(*f*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 145. Not. in Concil. *Bin.* pag. 410. *Lab.* col. 981.

Eccleſiaſtical Sentence, and upon the Order of the Synod they firſt pronounced it, and every Biſhop ſingle, declared *Dioſcorus* was depoſed and excommunicated (*g*): So that there was nothing of Authority in the Legates, but only their ſpeaking firſt, and declaring that which the whole Council had agreed upon. And becauſe *Anatolius* commonly ſpoke in the ſecond place, therefore he is joyned with *Leo*, and both of them together are called *the Princes of this Council* (*h*). So in one of the Epiſtles, after the Council, Leo *and* Anatolius *are ſaid to have regularly preſided herein* (*i*): By which Titles are meant only that they had the principal Places in this General Council: But the true Preſident of this great Synod, was the Emperor, who, when he was preſent, ſate above all the Biſhops in the midſt, and his Legates, the Lay-Judges, in his abſence, ſate there; and theſe Repreſentatives of the Emperor indeed had not only the moſt honourable place of all, but ſome Authority over the Synod it ſelf: For they propounded or allowed all matters to be debated; of them all Biſhops, even the Popes Legates (*k*), deſired leave to ſpeak; they ſummed up the Debates, and generally gave the deciſive Sentence, and upon that followed the Acclamations; ſo that theſe Judges performed all that the Modern Popes Legates in late Councils have taken upon them, ſince their Supremacy hath been in its greateſt Exaltation. If they object, that neither they nor the Emperor were allowed to be preſent when *Dioſcorus* was condemned according to the Canons (*l*). I Anſwer, the Judges in a former Seſſion, after a full hearing of the Cauſe, had determined (if the Emperor conſented) *that* Dioſcorus *ſhould have the ſame puniſhment which he had inflicted on* Flavianus, *and that he and his Accomplices ſhould by the Council be depoſed from Epiſcopal Dignity, according to the Canons*; to which Decree the whole Synod conſented (*m*): So that there was no more to be done in the third Seſſion, but only for the Biſhops canonically to execute this Sentence upon *Dioſcorus*; and there was no occaſion for the Emperor,

(*g*) Act. 3. *Bin.* pag. 192, &c. *Lab.* col. 421, &c.

(*h*) Act. 4. *Bin.* pag. 243. *Lab.* col. 540.

(*i*) Concil. Chalced. par. 3. num. 42. *Bin.* pag. 389. *Lab.* col. 933.

(*k*) Act. 4. *Bin.* pag. 236. *Lab.* col. 518. item Act. 16. *Bin.* pag. 334. *Lab.* col. 793.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 143. Not. *Bin.* pag. 412. *Lab.* col. 986.

(*m*) Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 152. *Lab.* col. 310.

ror, or the Lay-Judges to be preſent, only his confirmation of this Sentence was ſo neceſſary, that they writ both to *Marcian* and *Pulcheria* to deſire their confimation thereof (*n*): So that the chief Authority was in the Emperor and his Repreſentatives, the Biſhops adviſing, and they finally determining and confirming what was agreed upon, ſo that they were properly the Preſidents here.

(*n*) Act. 3. in fine, *Bin.* pag. 215. *Lab.* col. 463.

Thirdly, As to the Confirmation of all theſe Acts, the Notes affirm, *That all which was decreed here concerning the Faith againſt* Eutyches, *was confirmed and approved by* Leo's *Authority, as the Fathers had deſired of him in their Synodical Epiſtle*; but they pretend he *annulled and made void the* 28th *Canon* (*o*): And this they pretend to prove, not by the Synodical Epiſtle it ſelf, for that ſpeaks only of the Emperors confirmation, and never deſires the Pope to ratifie the matters of Faith, but ſaith, he and they by his Legates had agreed on theſe points, only they wiſh for his conſent to the 28*th* Canon about the Primacy of *Conſtantinople*, which his Legates had oppoſed (*p*). And indeed they ſuppoſed they had his conſent in all things which the Legates agreed to; and ſo thoſe paſſages cited by the Notes out of *Leo*'s Epiſtle, do not prove that he confirmed the Decrees of Faith, otherwiſe than by giving his common ſuffrage to them by his Legates, and agreeing with them afterwards (*q*): And thus all other Biſhops, who were abſent, and had Legates there, confirmed them as well as the Pope; as for his diſſent from that Canon, and their brags that he had made it void, we ſhall ſhew afterwards, that it remained in force for all the Popes oppoſition. But it may be obſerved how notoriouſly the Latin Verſion corrupts the Text to inſinuate this Papal confirmation; for in the Speech they made to the Emperor, in the end of the Council, the Latin hath theſe words, *Concilii hujus a vobis Congregati Prædicationem, Petri ſedis Authoritate roborantes*, implying that *the Popes Authority was to confirm the determinations of the Council*: But the Greek hath a quite

(*o*) Not in Concil. *Bin.* pag. 410. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 982. ita *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 159.

(*p*) Ep. Synod. ad *Leon.* Concil. Chal. par. 3. num. 2. *Bin.* pag. 351. *Lab.* col. 836.

(*q*) Vid. *Leon.* ep. 61. cit. in not. verb. [approbatum.]

quite different ſenſe, viz. *that the determinations of the Pope* (that is, *Leo*'s Epiſtle to *Flavianus*) *were confirmed by that Holy Council which the Emperor had gathered* (*r*): And not only that Speech, but many other evidences do ſhew clearly, that the Emperor confirmed the Decree of this Council. For Firſt, In the end of divers Acts, the Judges, as the Emperors Legates, do confirm what was agreed upon (*s*), and ſometimes promiſe to acquaint the Emperor for his confirmation (*t*): Yea, the Emperor in his Speech made to the Synod, ſaith *he came to the Synod to confirm the Faith, and not to ſhew his Power*, as *Baronius* and the Latin Verſion reads it (*u*); but the Greek more truly reads, *I came to the Synod to confirm what was agreed on*, &c. which ſhews ſufficiently, that the Emperor was to confirm all the Acts: Yea, in that very Seſſion wherein the Faith was ſubſcribed by the Biſhops, the Emperor expreſly *confirms it, and makes a penal Sanction againſt all that ſhall contradict or oppoſe it* (*w*), upon which the Fathers cried out thou *haſt confirmed the Orthodox Faith* (*x*): And a little while after the Council was ended, the ſame Emperor put out two Edicts, wherein he doth fully confirm the Decrees of this Holy Council, adding in the later, penalties to all that would not receive it (*y*). Wherefore we can make no doubt that the main confirmation of the Acts of this Council was from the Emperor.

(*r*) Concil. Chal. par. 3. num. 1. *Bin.* pag. 347. *Lab.* col. 828.

(*s*) Act. 4. *Bin.* pag. 248. *Lab.* col. 552.

(*t*) Act. 5. *Bin.* pag. 254. *Lab.* col. 568.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 141. vid. Act. 6. *Bin.* pag. 258. *Lab.* col. 577.

(*w*) Act. 6. *Bin.* pag 269. *Lab.* col. 608. ἡμεῖς ἐφ' ἁπάσης γαληνότητος ἐδοκίμασεν. &c. ib.

(*x*) Ibid. vid.

(*y*) Par. 3. Concil. num. 3, & 4. *Bin.* pag. 352, &c. *Lab.* col. 840, &c.

§. 3. In the next place we will conſider the ſeveral Seſſions and Acts which were in number ſixteen. In the firſt Action, *Baronius*, by miſtake, affirms, that the Emperor was preſent (*z*); but the Acts ſhew that he was only preſent by his Legates, the Lay-Judges, who repreſenting the Emperor the true Preſident of this Auguſt Aſſembly, ſate in a more honourable place than the Popes Legates, and here and always are named before them (*a*). But the Champions of the Supremacy boaſt extreamly of the great words of the Popes Legates concerning the See of *Rome*; who ſay in this firſt Action, on the mention of *Rome*, *which is the Head*

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 141.

(*a*) Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 34. *Lab.* col. 88.

Head of all Churches (*b*); and the Greek ſeems to refer it to Pope *Leo*. To which may be added, that the ſame Legates in the third Action, though they do not call the Pope *Head of the Univerſal Church*, as *Bellarmine* falſly cites their words (*c*); yet they magnifie St. *Peter as the Rock and groundwork of the Catholick Church, and the Foundation of true Faith* (*d*): And in ſome other places they call the Pope *Univerſal Biſhop*, &c. To which I anſwer, The Council no where gives the Biſhop of *Rome* any of theſe extravagant Titles, and did ſo little regard theſe empty brags of the Legates, that in the firſt Act, the Judges do reject the very firſt requeſt which *Leo*'s Legates made to the Council; and when they petitioned in *Leo*'s name, that *Dioſcorus* might ſtand at the Bar, the Judges bid him ſit down (*e*): And if we conſider how zealous this ambitious Pope was for the Dignity of his See, and that his Legates had been taught their Leſſon at *Rome*, we may juſtly argue from the Councils ſilence, and the lower Style of Arch-Biſhop which they give him, that theſe big Thraſonical Titles were not believed nor approved by them; for many things are reported in the Councils, as ſaid by particular perſons, which were not the Act of the whole Council; for which reaſon *Bellarmine* egregiouſly prevaricates, when he makes this whole General Council to call *Peter the Rock and Groundwork of the Catholick Church* (*f*); For it was only the Popes Domeſticks called him ſo; and had the Council foreſeen the conſequence, they would expreſly have oppoſed, that which they only ſilently paſſed by as frivolous. In the next place we may obſerve, that it is ſaid in this Council, *that the Emperor confirmed the Acts of the ſecond Council at* Epheſus (*g*), therefore it was uſual then for the Emperor ſo to do, ſince this is alledged to prove that *a lawful Council*. Again, when the Acts of this ſecond Council at *Epheſus* were read at *Chalcedon*, the Greek plainly ſaith, *the Emperor by his Letters exhorted the Pope to be preſent there*, but the Latin Verſion corrupts the Text, and puts in *ſupplicarunt* (*h*), as if

(*b*) Ibid. *Bin.* p. 41. *Lab.* col. 94.

(*c*) *Bellarm.* de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11. pag. 85.

(*d*) Act. 3. *Bin.* pag. 192. *Lab.* col. 425.

(*e*) Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 41. *Lab.* col. 94.

(*f*) *Bellarm.* de Rom. Pontif. lib. 1. cap. 10. pag. 540.

(*g*) Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 48. *Lab.* col. 111.

(*h*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 52. *Lab.* col. 122. τῷ ὁμοίῳ τύπῳ.

if the Emperor had humbly ſupplicated the Pope to be there; whereas one of his Legates, a few lines before, owned, *that the Pope had the ſame Form of Summons ſent him, that was ſent to the other great Biſhops.* Moreover, in *Eutyches* Petition read in that Council, Cyril *is called the Preſident of the third General Council at* Epheſus (*i*), without any mention of the Pope: And we may further obſerve, that the Heretick *Eutyches*, in the Acts of the Council of *Conſtantinople* which condemned him, is called Pope *Eutyches*, that being a name formerly given to all Eminent Clergy-men, eſpecially in the *Eaſt* (*k*). I ſhall make no more remarks upon this firſt Seſſion, which was ſpent in reading over and reviewing the Council of *Conſtantinople*, wherein *Eutyches* was condemned, and the Pſeudo-Synod of *Epheſus* wherein *Dioſcorus* abſolved him, becauſe I have treated of both before: It is ſufficient to obſerve upon this full hearing, the Council of *Chalcedon* condemned both *Eutyches* and *Dioſcorus*, and the Lay-Judges ſumm'd up the Act; but there ſeems to be a Roman addition in the end of this firſt Act, where it is thruſt in without choerence and ſenſe, *that* Leo *writ an Epiſtle to* Flavianus; which, though it be true (*l*), comes in very impertinently here; but the Forger thought when the Writings of the Orthodox Fathers were mentioned, that of *Leo* ought by all means to be mentioned right or wrong.

(*i*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 57. *Lab.* col. 135.

(*k*) Ibid. *Bin.* p. 90. *Lab.* col. 222.

(*l*) In fin. Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 153. *Lab.* col. 310.

In the ſecond Action there is nothing conſiderable, but the reading of this very Epiſtle of *Leo* to *Flavianus* (after the Nicene and Conſtantinopolitan Creed) being written expreſly about the *Eutychian* Hereſie, the main Cauſe to be then decided (*m*); which was therefore received there as other Orthodox Writings were, with general Acclamations; but the Notes, citing theſe Acclamations, quote them imperfectly no further than theſe words, Peter *ſpeaks by* Leo(*n*): But the Council goes on, and ſays, *The Apoſtles and* Cyril *taught thus*, by which we may ſee it was the conſonancy of *Leo*'s Doctrine, to the writings of the Apoſtles, and of St. *Cyril*, not the in-

(*m*) Act. 2. *Bin* pag. 151. *Lab.* col. 344.

(*n*) Not. in Concil. *Bin.* p. 412. *Lab.* col. 986. Collat. cum Act. 2. *Bin.* p. 169. *Lab.* col. 368.

infallibility of his See which procured his Epiſtle this general applauſe. Wherefore the Prefacer need not have mentioned theſe Acclamations, as if they were only given to *Leo*'s Epiſtle, or had been made upon ſome ſingle excellency peculiar to the Biſhop of that See (*o*); for both the Creeds, and two of *Cyril*'s Epiſtles had been honoured with ſuch like Acclamations a little before.

(*o*) Pref. *Bin.* p. 4. *Lab.* col. 7.

The third Action contains the canonical depoſition of *Dioſcorus*, after the Biſhops had heard all the complaints againſt him, cited him thrice, and could not prevail with him to appear. Now there being nothing to be done at this Seſſion, but to proceed according to the Canons, of which the Biſhops were the proper Executors; they only met, without Lay-Judges, which (ſaith *Binius*) *is the moſt evident note of a General Council* (*p*), but in truth it is no note of any ſuch matter; for if that were not a General Council, wherein ſome of the Laity were preſent, then there never was any General Council till this time, and this ſingle Act could then be the ſole Regular Act of this General Council; to ſuch abſurd conſequences doth theſe mens blind zeal lead them. The next thing to be noted is, a corruption in the Titles of the Petitions, which ſome of the Ægyptian Clergy offered to the Council againſt *Dioſcorus*; for the Greek hath no more but this, *The Petition of* Theodorus, *the Deacon*, exhibited againſt *Dioſcorus*; but the Latin Verſion thruſts in Pope *Leo*'s name thus, *exhibited to Pope* Leo *and the Council of* Chalcedon (*q*), and the ſame corruption is in the Titles of the following Petitions of *Iſchyrion*, *Athanaſius* and *Sophronius*. If it be objected, that the Superſcriptions of all theſe Petitions, both in Greek and Latin are, *To the moſt Holy*, &c. —*Univerſal Patriarch of Great* Rome, Leo, *and to the Holy General Council*, &c. (*r*). I reply, theſe Superſcriptions ſeem to be forged alſo: For firſt, *Euſebius* his Petition before, mentions not *Leo*, and theſe Petitions are addreſſed only to the Council, there being not the leaſt ſentence in them peculiar to *Leo*, or ſuppoſing him to

(*p*) Not. in Concil. *Bin.* pag. 412. *Lab.* col. 986.

(*q*) Act. 3. *Bin.* p. 181. *Lab.* col. 396.

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 144.

ſee

ſee or read them; ſo that theſe Superſcriptions to an abſent Biſhop are non-ſenſe, and in all probability added by ſome Roman Tranſcribers, as may be gueſſed by the great ſwelling Titles, with which the Pope is loaded. Again, in the Summons ſent to *Dioſcorus* the third time, it is declared, *that the Emperor had commanded the Biſhops to hear this Cauſe*; the Greek word is [ἐπέτρεψε], but the Latin ſoftens it into [*permiſit*] (*s*). However, whether the Emperor commanded or permitted the Biſhops to hear this Cauſe, it is plain, that even in this Seſſion, conſiſting only of Clergy, the Biſhops had the Emperors leave, and proceeded by his permiſſion. As to the Sentence it ſelf; the Preface (*t*), the Notes (*u*) and *Baronius* (*w*) pretend it was pronounced in *Leo*'s name, and boaſt much of the Legates pronouncing it. But if we conſult the place, we ſhall find that ſince no Lay-Judges were there, the Popes Legates were (as theſe Judges did in other Seſſions) to collect the Votes, and then to ſum them up, and publiſh them; and therefore, after the enquiry was ended, they ask what the Synod thought fit to be done; which they do over and over again, and till the Council expreſly commanded them, they did not pronounce the Sentence (*x*). 'Tis true, theſe Legates had learned their Leſſons ſo well at *Rome*, that they contrive it in words very pompous, *The moſt Holy and Bleſſed Arch-Biſhop of the Elder and Greater* Rome, Leo, *by us, and by this preſent Synod, with the moſt Bleſſed and Honourable Apoſtle*, Peter, *who is the Rock and Groundwork of the Catholick Church, and he that is the Foundation* (*y*) *of the Orthodox Faith*, (*that is, Jeſus Chriſt*) *hath deprived him of his Epiſcopal Dignity, and degraded him from all Miniſtration; therefore let this moſt Holy General Council decree concerning the ſaid* Dioſcorus *what is agreeable to the Canons* (*z*). But theſe Rhetorical Flouriſhes, coming only from the Popes Domeſticks, give him no right to them; it is more material what Cardinal *Cuſanus* obſerves, *that the Legates, as ſitting firſt in this Council, firſt pronounce Sentence by the Synods command, and then all the reſt in order*;

(*s*) Act. 3. ib. *Bin.* p. 189. *Lab.* col. 417.

(*t*) Pref. *Bin.* p. 4. *Lab.* col. 7.

(*u*) Not. in Concil. *Bin.* p. 413. *Lab.* col. 987.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 451. p. 145.

(*x*) Act. 3. *Bin.* p. 191, 192. *Lab.* col. 421, &c.

(*y*) καὶ ἐκεῖνος, omiſſam in edit. *Bin.* & *Lab.* è ver. edit. reſtituit *Richer.* Hiſt. Concil. Gen. Tom. 1. p. 395.

(*z*) Act. 3. *Bin.* p. 192. *Lab.* col. 425.

and the force of the Sentence depends upon the agreeing Votes of all: And we ſee, that though the Pope had before canonically depoſed Dioſcorus, *yet his Sentence was re-examined in a General Council* (*a*). This is certain, that *Anatolius*, of *Conſtantinople*, and all the reſt, though in modeſter words, did ſingly condemn *Dioſcorus*, and he was depoſed and degraded by the Authority of the General Council, and the free Votes of the ſeveral Biſhops, who, as Pope *Leo* himſelf ſpeaks, had *confirmed his Sentence with an aſſent, which made the Cauſe uncapable of being tried any more* (*b*). And the Sentence which was publiſhed about his depoſition (*c*), as well as the Letter writ to *Alexandria* (*d*) expreſly declare, *that he was depoſed and degraded by the Holy General Council* (*e*): And the very ſame is affirmed in the Synodical Epiſtles, writ to *Martian* and *Pulcheria*, to deſire them to confirm the Councils Sentence (*e*). So that in vain do the Modern Romaniſts brag of the depoſition of *Dioſcorus* by the Popes Supream Authority; for it was the opinion indeed of the Pope, before the Council met, that he ought to be depoſed; but it was the Authority of the Council, ratified by the Emperor, which actually depoſed him.

(*a*) *Cuſan.* lib. de Concord. Cath. lib. 2. c. 8.

(*b*) *Leo* ep. 63. ad *Theod.*

(*c*) Act. 3. *Bin.* p. 214. *Lab.* col. 460.

(*d*) *Bin.* ib. *Lab.* col. 461.

(*e*) Ib. *Bin.* p. 215. *Lab.* col. 463.

In the fourth Act, the Epiſtle of Pope *Leo* to *Flavianus* (wherein the Hereſie of *Eutyches* was confuted and condemned) was ſubſcribed by all the Biſhops, who ſeverally declared they received it, becauſe it was agreeable to the Faith declared in the three former General Councils of *Nice*, *Conſtantinople* and *Epheſus*; and ſome of them add, *becauſe it was agreeable to the Scripture, and to the Expoſitions of the Orthodox Fathers* (*f*). Now had theſe Fathers believed the Pope to be Infallible in matters of Faith, they muſt have received this Epiſtle only upon the Credit of the Pope; whereas they now examin and judge of it by the Rules preſcribed in former Councils. and receive it, not becauſe the Enditer of it was Infallible, but becauſe he had kept cloſe to former determinations in General Councils. And ſince the buſineſs of this Council was to diſcover and

(*f*) Act. 4. *Bin.* p. 218. *Lab.* col. 471, &c.

and condemn the Hereſie of *Eutyches*, againſt which new Sect no eminent Biſhop but *Leo* had written, therefore this Epiſtle was made a Teſt, and all were obliged to ſubſcribe it, not (as the Romaniſts brag) becauſe the See of *Rome* was to fix the Rule of Faith; but becauſe this was the only Writing then extant of this kind; and we may as well prove that St. *Cyril* was the Supream Biſhop of the World, and the ſole Arbiter of Faith, becauſe his Epiſtles were ſubſcribed in the General Council of *Epheſus*, as a Teſt to find out and condemn the Neſtorians, as infer the Roman Supremacy or Infallibility from the Biſhops ſubſcribing *Leo*'s Epiſtle at *Chalcedon*. We may further note in this Action, that how confidently-ſoever modern Editors place the Councils of *Conſtantinople* and *Epheſus*, *under* Damaſus *and* Celeſtine; the Popes Legates here plainly ſay the Council of *Conſtantinople* was held *under the Emperor* Theodoſius *(g)*; and other Biſhops affirm, that Cyril *was the Preſident and Head of the Council at* Epheſus *(h)*: Again, it is to be noted, that though *Juvenalis of* Jeruſalem, *and four other Biſhops who had joyned with* Dioſcorus *in the Synod at* Epheſus, *to condemn Flavianus, repented and had ſubſcribed* Leo's *Epiſtle, and ſo declared themſelves to be Orthodox; yet the Council could not reſtore them to their Places, till the Emperor, by his Judges, gave them leave to determine their Caſe (i)*. It is alſo memorable, that the Egyptian Biſhops, after their own Patriarch *Dioſcorus* was depoſed, refuſed to ſign the Epiſtle of *Leo*, till they had a new Biſhop of *Alexandria*, under whoſe juriſdiction the Nicene Canons had put them; and though the Popes Legates and many others urged they ſhould ſubſcribe immediately, yet theſe Biſhops were excuſed by the Council, and their Plea allowed *(k)*; which ſhews, that thoſe who were under the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, owed no ſubjection at all to *Rome*; nor did they or the Council of *Chalcedon* think the Pope was really (what his Legates flatteringly call him) *the Univerſal Arch-Biſhop or Patriarch*, for then they could not have allowed this Plea. Moreover,

(g) Act. 4. *Bin.* pag. 217. *Lab.* col. 471.

(h) Ib. *Bin.* p. 218, & 221. *Lab.* col. 474, & 482.

(i) Ibid *Bin.* pag 232. *Lab.* col. 507.

(k) Ibid. *Bin.* p. 233. *Lab.* col. 510, &c.

over, 'tis obſervable in this Act, that *Photius*, Biſhop of *Tyre*, affirms, *both* Anatolius *and* Leo *were the Preſidents of this Council* (*l*): Alſo this Biſhop in his Petition to the Emperors, ſtiles them *Lords of the Earth and Sea, and of all Men, Nations and Kindreds* (*m*); which ſhews that Titles are not to be ſtrictly underſtood, or to be made any ground for Argument, ſince Complements were uſed then as well as now; and therefore the Romaniſts ſhould not attempt to prove a right from every flouriſhing Title beſtowed on the Pope by thoſe who ſpeak of him. In the Cauſe between this *Photius* of *Tyre*, and *Euſtathius* of *Berytus*, there is a paſſage, how one of theſe Biſhops claimed a right to ſome Churches by the Imperial Edicts, and the other by the Canons; and he who claimed a right by the Canons, got the better: Yea, the Council declared, that *Edicts ought not to prevail againſt the Canons* *. From whence *Baronius* infers, *that Princes ought to learn from hence to make their Laws ſubmit to the Eccleſiaſtical Canons* (*n*). But it muſt be noted, this was not intended to be a Rule in all Caſes, only as to the old Rights of Biſhops Juriſdictions; and it was a Rule made now, only upon this occaſion; and which is moſt remarkable, the Judges tell the Council, *it was the Emperor's pleaſure, this Cauſe ſhould be tried, not by the Edicts, but by the Canons*; for which the Biſhops gave that pious Emperor thanks: And therefore it is a great fallacy to argue from hence, that Eccleſiaſtical Canons are above the Laws of Princes in their own nature; only in this Caſe the Good Emperor, to oblige the Biſhops, ſuffered the Canons to prevail. To conclude, this Seſſion ended with a confirmation of all things done by the Lay-Judges, who declare they ſhould remain firm (*o*), and ſo the Seſſion ended.

(*l*) Ib. *Bin.* p. 243. *Lab.* col. 540.

(*m*) Ib. p. 244. *Lab.* col. 541.

* Act. 4. *Bin.* p. 245. *Lab.* col. 544.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 451. p. 149.

(*o*) Act. 4. *Bin.* p. 248. *Lab.* col. 552.

In the Fifth Action, wherein the Matters of Faith were to be declared, the Emperors Legates were preſent, and prevented a Schiſm which was like to happen among the Biſhops, ſome of which would not conſent to the Councils definition; but the Lay-Judges from the

the Emperor adviſed the Diſſenters to go with *Anatolius* and the Popes Legates, and to confer among themſelves ſo as they might agree, otherwiſe they threatned that the Emperor reſolved to call a Council in the *Weſt*, to which they muſt go to determin the difference (*p*): From whence we may note, that they knew of no ſingle Perſon who could finally decide queſtions of Faith; and though it was to be determined at *Rome*, a general Council muſt do it there: However, this Method proved effectual, and ſo they publiſhed their Faith unanimouſly, annexing it to the Creeds of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople* (*q*). We ſhall only note further, that in the Acclamations made in this Seſſion it is ſaid, *That the Councils definition had confirmed* Leo's *Epiſtle, and the Faith of* Leo *is commended becauſe he believed as* Cyril *believed:* And after all, the Biſhops agreement was not ſufficient to ratifie this definition of Faith, till it was ſhewed to the Emperor (*r*) as the laſt words import.

(*p*) Act. v. *Bin.* pag. 250. *Lab.* col. 560.

(*q*) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 251. *Lab.* col. 561.

(*r*) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 254. *Lab.* col. 568.

The Sixth Action was adorned with the preſence of the Emperor *Marcianus*, who made a Speech to the Fathers, (which *Baronius* by miſtake ſaith was in the firſt Seſſion (*s*);) telling them he was come to confirm the Faith they had agreed on, (as *Conſtantine* did) not to ſhew his power (*t*). Which is a clear and undeniable proof, that the confirmation of their Decrees depended on the Emperor, in whoſe preſence the definition of Faith was read and ſubſcribed by every one of the Biſhops; and he declared his Approbation thereof, and in the open Synod appoints penalties for them who ſhould, after this, call theſe Points into queſtion (*u*). And then he gives them ſome Rules, to be formed into Canons, becauſe they related to Eccleſiaſtical Affairs; after which having been highly Applauded by the Biſhops, he was petitioned to dimiſs them, but told them they muſt not depart for ſome few days, and ſo took his leave of them. Which ſhews that the Emperor who convened them, had alſo the ſole power to diſſolve this general Council: I ſhall add what *Richerius*

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 450, pag. 141.

(*t*) Act. vi. *Bin.* pag. 258. *Lab.* col. 577.

(*u*) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 269, &c. *Lab.* col. 608.

cherius obſerves upon that definition of Faith made in this Seſſion, that it contains many of the very words and expreſſions of the *Athanaſian* Creed; and though he doubt whether *Athanaſius* did compoſe that Form which bears his name; yet he ſaith, *It is now become the Creed of the Catholick Church, and there is not a Title in it which is not agreeable to the Credit, Holineſs and Learning of* Athanaſius (*w*). He notes alſo the policy of the Popes Legates, who contrary to all ancient uſage, and to the Primitive ſimplicity of the former Councils, do moſt impertinently put this Epithete to the Popes name, *Biſhop of the Univerſal Church of the City of* Rome (*x*). But when I conſider the abſurdity of the expreſſion, and the frequent corruptions in theſe Acts, why might not that bold hand who added to the Legates name, *Preſident of the Council*; in this very place (and in this Seſſion where the Emperor being preſent certainly preſided) add this huffing Title to the Pope's name? And if ſo, it is a corruption and can be no ground for an Argument: However, 'tis a great prejudice to all theſe Titles, that when any others of the Council ſpeak of the Pope, they call him only *Biſhop or Archbiſhop, and none but his own Legates load him with thoſe vain Titles.*

(*w*) *Richer.* Hiſt. Concil. gen. Tom. 1. pag. 407.

(*x*) Act. 6. *Bin.* pag. 259. *Lab.* col. 580.

The Seventh Action contains only the Ratification of a private Agreement, made between *Maximus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, and *Juvenalis* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, concerning the extent of their Juriſdictions (*y*).

(*y*) Act. 7. *Bin.* pag. 271. *Lab.* col. 612.

The Eighth Action was the caſe of *Theodoret*, who having formerly favoured *Neſtorius*, yet being afterwards convinced of his Error, was received into Communion by Pope *Leo*, who had judged his cauſe and acquitted him before the Council met: But for all that, the caſe was heard over again, and he called an Heretick, and had been expelled the Council, if he had not cleared himſelf over again by ſubſcribing *Leo*'s Epiſtle, and *Anathematizing Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, upon which he was reſtored to Communion and to his Biſhoprick (*z*): By which it is as clear as the Sun, that the

(*z*) Act. 8. *Bin.* pag. 273. *Lab.* col. 617.

the Council was above the Pope, and had Authority to Judge over again the Cauſes he had determined; and alſo that barely being in Communion with the Pope, could not clear any Man from Hereſie, nor give him a right to the Communion of the Catholick Church. And if the Epiſtles of *Theodoret* to *Leo* be genuin, (whereof there is good cauſe to doubt) and this cauſe were referred to the Pope by Appeal; (as the Romaniſts brag) This makes the matter worſe, and ſhews that the laſt Appeal is not to the Pope, and that he cannot finally decide any cauſe, which ſhall not be liable to be tried again in a general Council, yea though it be, as this was, a Cauſe of Faith; which utterly ruins the Infallibility.

The Ninth and Tenth Actions, concern *Ibas* Biſhop of *Edeſſa*, who had been a *Neſtorian*, and was depoſed by *Dioſcorus* in the Pſeudo Synod of *Epheſus*, in which are theſe obſervables: Firſt, The Emperor commanded a Lay-man and ſome Neighbouring Biſhops to hear this Cauſe, firſt at *Tyre*, and then at *Berytus* (*a*); ſo that even Provincial Councils did not meet without the Emperors Authority, and the Popes univerſal ſupremacy was not known then. For in the Council of *Berytus*, *Antioch* is called an Apoſtolical Throne (*b*), and *Ibas* calls the Biſhop of *Antioch* his Prince (*c*), and the Council after they had reſtored him to his Biſhoprick, referred the cauſe between him and *Nonnus*, (who had been thruſt into his place) to *Maximus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, as the proper Judge of that matter. No more is here to be noted, but only that the Popes Legates and the whole Council deſire, that the Emperor would revoke and utterly annul the Epheſine falſe Synod (*d*). For though the Pope had done this, yet they knew that was inſufficient, ſince none but the Emperor had right effectually to confirm, or null a Council which pretended to be Oecumenical. To this Action *Baronius* and *Binius* tack another, concerning an allowance to be made to maintain *Domnus* late Biſhop of *Antioch*, who had been depoſed (*e*): But they own this is not

(*a*) Act. 9 & 10. *Bin.* pag. 277. & pag. 280. *Lab.* col. 628. & 637.

(*b*) Act. 10 *Bin.* pag. 283. *Lab.* col. 644.

(*c*) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 289. *Lab.* col. 660.

(*d*) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 294. *Lab.* col. 673.

(*e*) *Bin.* pag. 298. *Lab.* col. 681. *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 155.

in the Greek, nor was there any ſuch thing in the Acts of the Council in *Juſtinian*'s time, who expreſly affirms *Domnus* was dead before, which is certainly true (*f*); Wherefore the Cardinal owns they found this in an old Latin Copy, in the *Vatican*, the very Mint of Forgeries; and this Action ought to be rejected as a mear Fiction.

(*f*) Vid. Cratenthorp. vigil. dormit. chap. 35. § 9.

The Eleventh and Twelfth Actions were ſpent in examing the cauſe of *Baſſianus* and *Stephanus*, both pretending to be Biſhops of *Epheſus*, wherein we may obſerve: That *Baſſianus* pleads, he was duly elected by the ſuffrage of the Nobility, People and Clergy of that City and the Emperor confirmed the Election (*g*); for the Pope had not then uſurped the nomination or confirmation of remote Biſhops. Again, whereas *Baronius* brags, *that the Pope depoſed* Baſſianus *from the Biſhoprick of* Epheſus, and cites the words of *Stephen* his *Antagoniſt* thus, *it is now four years ſince the Roman Biſhop depoſed* Baſſianus——*arguing from thence, That it was the ancient uſage for the Pope to depoſe Metropolitans* (*h*); He doth notoriouſly prevaricate, for *Stephen*'s words are, *ſince the Roman Biſhop depoſed him, and the Biſhop of* Alexandria *condemned him*: And a little before the ſame *Stephen* ſaith more fully, *That* Baſſianus *was expelled by the holy Fathers,* Leo *and* Flavianus *and the Biſhops of* Alexandria *and* Antioch (*i*). By which the Reader may ſee there is no credit to be given to *Baronius* Quotations, who always reſolves by falſe Citations of Authors, to aſcribe that to the Pope alone, which was done by him in conjunction with other Biſhops: And it appears, that the principal right over *Epheſus* was in the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, whence it was pleaded by the Friends of Baſſianus, *that* Proclus *of* Conſtontinople *who had the right, received him to Communion*: And *Stephen* urges, *that* Flavianus *of* Conſtantinople *expelled him afterwards* (*k*). And therefore it is remarkable, that in the twefth Action where the Sentence was to be pronounced, *Anatolius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* declares his Judgment before the Popes Legates,

(*g*) Act. 11. *Bin.* pag. 300. *Lab.* col. 688.

(*h*) *Baron. An.* 447. pag. 49.

(*i*) Act. 11. *Bin.* pag. 301. *Lab.* col. 689.

(*k*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 302. *Lab.* col. 692.

gates, and is always named before them in all that Seſſion, where a Cauſe was to be decided concerning a Church, which was ſpecially under his juriſdiction (*l*); by which it appears, the principal Perſon in the deposing of *Baſſianus*, was the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who probably deſired the other great Patriarchs concurrence for the better credit of his Sentence: Moreover it is to be noted, that though Pope *Leo* favoured the cauſe of *Stephen*, and writ an Epiſtle in his behalf mentioned in the Council; The Popes favour did him no ſervice, for his Cauſe was tried over again, and he depoſed by this general Council as well as *Baſſianus*; and this by the conſent of the Popes Legates, who notwithſtanding their big words, did not believe it unlawful for a general Council to contradict a determination of the Popes.

(*l*) Act. 12. *Bin.* pag. 305, 306. *Lab.* col. 771. &c.

The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Actions concern only the Cauſes of private Biſhops, who had complained to the Emperor (not to the Pope) of injury done them; and the Emperor appointed them to be finally determined by the Council, and ſo the Biſhop of *Nichomedias*'s Juriſdiction was cleared, and the Biſhop of *Nice* ordered to be content only with the honour of a Metropolitan (*m*). And in the fourteenth Action *Athanaſius* was ſetled in the Biſhoprick of *Perrhæa*; and *Sabinianus*, who claimed it, ordered to keep the honour of a Biſhop, and to be maintained out of the Profits of that Church, as the Patriarch of *Antioch* ſhould direct (*n*). Nothing is remarkable in them, but only that the Lay Judges pronounce the Decree, and not the Popes Legates, and then the Synod conſent.

(*m*) Act. 13. *Bin.* pag. 307. *Lab.* col. 708.

(*n*) Act. 14. *Bin.* p. 311. *Lab.* col. 717.

The Fifteenth Action contains the Canons of this General Council for Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, three of which were recommended to the Fathers by the Emperor to be formed into Canons (*o*): So that in obedience to the Emperor, they were obliged to make ſome Eccleſiaſtical Rules: And one of theſe is the fourth Canon, which decrees, that all Monks every where ſhall be ſubject to the Biſhop of that Dioceſs

(*o*) Supr. Act. 5.

wherein their Monaſtery is built (*p*); which being a genuine Canon of a General Council, not objected againſt by the Popes Legates, it is ſomewhat ſtrange that the Modern Popes have no regard to it, but daily and openly break it, in defiance of the Primitive Diſcipline, by exempting all Monaſteries from due ſubjection to their own Biſhop (*q*); and this meerly out of policy to make the Monks intirely depend upon the Pope, and ſerve his intereſts. The ninth Canon ordains, that the Cauſes betwen Clergy-men ſhall be tried before their own Biſhop, and not in Secular Courts; and if a Biſhop have a complaint againſt his Metropolitan, he ſhall go *to the Primate of the Dioceſs, or appeal to the See of* Conſtantinople: Which Canon Pope *Nicholas* reſolved to force into his intereſt, and ſo ridiculouſly expounds, *the Primate of the Dioceſs,* is meant the *Biſhop of* Rome, *who is Primate of all Dioceſes* (*r*): *Turrian* as boldly expounds it, *the Primate of the univerſal Dioceſs:* And *Binius* in his Notes will have the word to ſignifie *the Prince of the Chriſtian Dioceſs* (*s*). But all theſe feigned additions and forced gloſſes will not help them, becauſe the Canon gives leave to the Party injured to complain, either to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, or to the Pope, at his own choice, which ſets that Patriarch upon equal ground with him of *Rome.* But the Original Word ſignifies an Order of Biſhops below a Patriarch, but above a Metropolitan; and the Canon expreſly limits Appeals either to be made by theſe, Ἐξάρχοις, Primates, who had Juriſdiction over the Province, or to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; which ſhews that this Council never thought of any Right that *Rome* then had to receive Appeals from all parts of the World. And if any queſtion why the Pope is not here named, at leaſt, for the Weſtern Churches Appeals, as well as the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* for the Eaſtern; I take the true reaſon to be, the abſence of the Popes Legates from this Seſſion, conſiſting only of Oriental Biſhops; for which reaſon they modeſtly refuſed to decree any thing concerning Diſcipline in the

(*p*) Act. 15. *Bin.* pag. 326. *Lab.* col. 757.

(*q*) Vid. *Bever.* not. in Can. Chalced. 4. Tom. 2. p. 111.

(*r*) *Nicol.* 1. ep. 8. ad *Mich.* Imp.

(*s*) *Bin.* not. p. 418. *Lab.* col. 996.

the *Weſt*, leaving affairs there to proceed according to parity of Reaſon. We may add, that the Latin Verſion of the ſixteenth Canon hath put in the word [*confitentes*] into the Body of the Canon, which is not in the Original *, but *Labbè* leaves out this corruption.

* *Bin.* pag. 328.

But that which hath occaſioned the greateſt Controverſie, is the twenty eighth Canon, *wherein this Council confirms the Decrees of the Fathers, and the ſecond Council of* Conſtantinoples *Canon about the Priviledges of that See. For as the Fathers had given the See of* Rome *its priviledges, becauſe it was the Imperial City, for the ſame reaſon the ſecond General Council gave like honour to the See of* Conſtantinople; *and would have it alſo even in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, to be advanced to the ſecond place: And they order that the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *ſhould ordain and have a Juriſdiction over all the Metropolitans of the Dioceſes of* Pontus, Aſia *and* Thrace (*t*). The Modern Romaniſts do all they can to ſuppreſs or baffle this Canon. The Editors put a Note before it, that it is not in their Greek Manuſcripts; but that is no wonder, ſince it hath been long the deſign of their Church to conceal this Canon; but that ſuch a Canon was really made at *Chalcedon*, is apparent, not only from the ſixteenth Action, where it was read at large, and allowed by the whole Council, and confirmed by the Lay-Judges, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of the Popes Legates; But it is alſo found in all the Greek Collectors, cited in *Photius* his Nomo-Canon (writ above 900 year ago) and is alſo extant in that old Latin Interpreter, who put out the Canons before *Dioniſius exiguus* (that is, ſoon after the year 500) (*u*): So that there is no doubt but this Canon was really made at *Chalcedon*. Yet *Gratian* would not cite it under the name of a Canon of *Chalcedon*, but quotes it out of the ſixth General Council, wherein there are almoſt the ſame words; but his old Editions (which were in uſe while the Roman Primacy was ſetting up) had groſly corrupted the main words of it, and inſtead of the affirmative *etiam in rebus Eccleſiaſticis non ſecus, ac illam*

(*t*) Act. 15. *Bin.* pag. 330. *Lab.* col. 769.

(*u*) *Bever.* Pand. Tom. 2. annot. pag. 124.

illam extolli, —— &c. it was in him *non tamen in rebus Eccleſiaſticis magnificetur, ut illa* (*w*), which quite alters the ſenſe, and makes it ſeem as if the Council had not ſpoken of any Eccleſiaſtical Priviledges; whereas they ſpeak of no other but ſuch. Now this was ſo apparent a falſification, that the later Copies of *Gratian* have mended it, and made it *nec non* (*x*): But this was not till that Church had ſeen *Conſtantinople* under the Turkiſh Yoke, and in no capacity to vye with her.

(*w*) Vid. *Gratian.* Decret. par. 1. diſt. 22. c. 6. in not.

(*x*) Edit. in Octav. Francof. 1585.

In the Sixteenth Action the Popes Legates complain to the Judges, before all the Council, *That this Canon was made after their departure, and irregularly; and deſire it may be read: They were anſwered by the Arch-Deacon of* Conſtantinople, *that it was cuſtomary in General Councils to treat of Diſcipline after matters of Faith; that they told the Popes Legates this, and deſired their concurrence as to what ſhould be done for the Church of* Conſtantinople; *but they refuſed, ſaying they had other Orders; upon this they acquainted the Judges, and they commanded the Council to proceed; and ſo they did, nothing being done fraudulently, but all publickly and canonically; upon this the Canon aforeſaid was read* (*y*). Then the Legates Objections were heard and anſwered; Firſt to his inſinuation, that it was fraudulently obtained: The Biſhops all declared, and eſpecially thoſe of *Pontus* and *Aſia*, newly ſubjected to *Conſtantinople*, that they conſented and ſubſcribed to this Canon, without any circumvention or force, voluntarily and freely. Secondly, whereas the Legates pretended it was contrary to the Nicene Canons; and cite the ſixth Canon of *Nice* falſly, putting this forged Title (*That the Church of* Rome *always had the Primacy*) into the body of the Canon: The Council firſt diſcovers the fallacy by reading a true and authentick Record of that Canon, without that corrupt Addition, (though ſtill *Baronius* (*z*) and *Binius* (*a*) bluſh not to argue from this feigned Addition); and then was read the Canon of the ſecond Council at *Conſtantinople*, (for in that Age the Popes Cauſe was to be judged by the Canons) to both which this Canon of

(*y*) Act. 16. *Bin.* pag. 333. *Lab.* col. 792.

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 451. p. 157. c.

(*a*) *Bin.* Annot. pag. 418. col. 2. B. *Lab.* col. 997.

of *Chalcedon* was thought ſo agreeable, that the Biſhops principally concerned, declared again, they had freely ſubſcribed it as agreeable both to the Canons and Cuſtom. And *Euſebius*, Biſhop of *Dorylæum*, declares he read that Canon of *Conſtantinople*, here confirmed, to the Pope at *Rome*, and he owned it: Where by the way, *Baronius* egregiouſly prevaricates in expounding *hanc regulam* (that is, this Canon of the ſecond General Council) of *Euſebius* his rule or confeſſion of Faith (*b*), quite contrary to the plain ſenſe of the Biſhop here. To proceed, whereas the Legates objected Thirdly, That the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* had not formerly uſed the Rights now conferred on them; the contrary is manifeſt, both as to precedence, ſince all the Acts of this Council ſhew, that *Anatolius* ſate and ſpoke in the ſecond place next to the Popes Legates; and they had ſaid in the firſt Act, that his due was the ſecond place (*c*). And as to Juriſdiction, the very Biſhops of theſe Provinces do in theſe Acts, declare the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* had uſed it in their Countries and Dioceſes for many years: Upon which the Judges pronounce the Sentence, and give the ſecond place to *Conſtantinople*, with the Patriarchal Juriſdiction over thoſe Provinces named in the Canon, to which the whole Council conſents, except the Popes Legate, who entred his Proteſtation againſt it; but ſtill the Biſhops ſtood firm to the Canon, and the Judges declare it valid, with which this General Council is concluded. *Baronius* thinks the final Acclamations are wanting (*d*); if they be ſo, we may eaſily gueſs who raſed them out; even that Church which then, and ſince hath oppoſed this Canon, and would conceal that General Conſent by which it paſſed. But the laſt words are plain enough, where the Judges ſay, *The whole Synod hath confirmed it* (*e*), even though the Legates did diſſent. I ſhall conclude this Hiſtory of Fact, when I have noted two Corruptions in favour of the Roman Church, which are evident in this laſt Act. Firſt, The Latin Verſion affirms the Judges ſaid, Rome *truly*,

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 126. *Bin.* pag. 342. *Lab.* col. 816.

(*c*) Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 50. *Lab.* col. 115.

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 158.

(*e*) Act. 16. *Bin.* pag. 344. *Lab.* col. 820.

truly, by the Canons had all the Primacy, omnem Primatum; but the Greek is, πρὸ πάντων μὲν τὸ πρωτεῖα, *the Primacy before all others* (*f*), which is not a Supremacy over all other Biſhops, but the firſt place among them. Again, the Legates in the Latin Copy ſay, *The Apoſtolical See ought not to be humbled in our preſence*; but the Greek is quite different, that is, *the Apoſtolical Throne commanded that all things ſhould be done in our preſence* (*g*): But he who made the alteration was one who dream'd that this Canon was to humble *Rome*, whereas it takes not away the firſt place from the Pope, only gives the ſecond equal Priviledges within its own bounds to *Conſtantinople*.

(*f*) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 343. *Lab.* col. 817.

(*g*) Id. ibid.

§. 4. We ſhall now proceed to the third part concerning what was done after the Council, and there will ſhew that this Canon was valid, notwithſtanding the diſſent of the Popes Legates, and *Leo*'s furious endeavours to annull it.

The firſt thing, after the Councils ſpeech to the Emperor, in the old Collectors of Councils, was the Imperial Edicts, by which the Decrees were confirmed; but theſe late Editors have removed theſe into the third place (*b*): And firſt ſet down a pretended Letter from the Council to the Pope, which is done only to impoſe upon unwary Readers, and make them think it was not the Emperor, but the Pope who had the power of confirming the Acts. But as to the Epiſtle it ſelf, it was dated in the end of *March*, four Months after the Council was ſeparated; and (if it be not a Forgery, as ſome vehemently ſuſpect, on the account of a fooliſh and improbable ſtory in it of *Euphemia*'s dead body confirming the true Faith by a Miracle) it was writ not by the General Council, but by *Anatolius*, after he had heard of the Popes diſlike of the twenty eighth Canon; and therefore he doth not deſire his conſent to any other thing, but only labours to gain his aſſent to this Cannon (*i*). So that *Baronius* falſly argues from hence, *it was the cuſtom to ſend the Decrees*

(*b*) *Bin.* par. 3. num. 3, & 4. pag. 352, &c. *Lab.* pag. 840.

(*i*) Par. 3. num. 2. *Bin.* pag. 350. *Lab.* col. 833.

of

of General Councils to Rome, *to be confirmed by the Popes Authority* (*k*): For this Letter was not writ by a General Council, nor doth it desire a confirmation of any thing but one Canon, which stood firm notwithstanding the Pope always disallowed it: I only note that where the original is συνήθως κηδόμενος, that is, *taking his wonted care*, the Latin reads *consuetè gubernando*: As if the Pope had by custom governed all Churches as far as *Constantinople* (*l*). I observe also, that *Binius* leaves out the date of this Epistle to the Pope, which is later in time than either of the Imperial Edicts; hoping by that means the cheat of placing it before those Edicts would be undiscovered, and that easie People might judge it a formal Letter writ while the Council was sitting, to Petition the Pope to confirm all they had done. I shall not insist upon any more particulars, but smile at *Baronius*, who for a few Complements, that the writer of this Letter gives the Pope, draws a serious Argument for the Supremacy, and would have all Bishops, even in a General Council, to be *Sons to their Holy Father the Pope* (*m*). To proceed, the Edicts of the Emperor are dated, one in *February*, and the other in *March*, and they do effectually confirm the Acts of the Council, and ordain penalties on such as oppose the definitions of the Synod (*n*). After this follow three Letters of Pope *Leo*, dated all of one day, directed to *Anatolius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, and to the Emperor and Empress *Marcianus* and *Pulcheria* (*o*), in all which he shews his consent to the other things done at *Chalcedon*; but argues and exclaims against the 28*th* Canon, saying in his Letter to *Pulcheria*, *that by the Authority of* Peter *be utterly makes it void.* But all this spoils the Cause; for notwithstanding all his huffing, this Canon did remain in Force; for *Liberatus*, who writ in the next Century, saith, *The Judges and all the Bishops did not value the Legates protestation*; *and though the Apostolical See still oppose it, this which was confirmed by the Synod, by the Emperors, Patronage remains even till now* (*p*); and *Almain* of later times affirms, *the Constitution*

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 159.

(*l*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 351. *Lab.* col. 837.

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 451. pag. 159.

(*n*) Par. 3. num. 3 & 4. *Bin.* pag. 352. *Lab.* col. 840.

(*o*) Ibid. num. 5, 6, 7. *Bin.* pag. 354, &c. *Lab.* col. 844.

(*p*) *Liberat.* Brev. cap. 13. *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 2. pag. 186.

tution of the Council prevailed over the proteſtations of Leo *againſt it: For the Canons of general Councils do prevail over the oppoſite Decrees of Popes* (*q*). And the Hiſtory of following times doth clearly ſhew, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was ever after this reckoned the ſecond Patriarch, and took his place accordingly in ſucceeding Councils, and retained the juriſdiction over thoſe Provinces which this Canon gives him: Wherefore it is very weak in *Baronius*, from ſome bold paſſages in *Leo*'s Letters to draw this conſequence, *that it is clearly in the ſole power of the Pope to make void, what* 630 *Biſhops in Council, the Emperor and Senate had agreed on and confirmed* (*r*). For the contrary is clear as the Sun, that the Legates contradiction there, and the Popes ranting afterwards, for all his pretended Authority of St. *Peter*, did not ſignify any thing towards a real annulling this Canon; and the more he ſtrove to do it, the more he ſhewed his Pride to be above his Power: And indeed General Councils were needleſs, precarious and inſignificant, if any one Biſhop were not to be concluded by the major vote, or had a negative voice there. But becauſe the Pope argues as well as condemns, let us hear his reaſons againſt this Canon: Firſt, He every where urges, *it is contrary to the Nicene Canon*: But this is falſe; he and his Legates indeed pretend this, but the Nicene Canon was read over in open Council, and all of them unanimouſly agreed, it did no way contradict it: The Council of *Nice* declared thoſe Patriarchates, which Cuſtom had then ſetled, and (ſince after that time *Conſtantinople* came to be the Imperial City,) the ſecond General Council, and this at *Chalcedon* had as good right to declare *Conſtantinople* a Patriarchate, as the firſt at *Nice* had to declare others; and ſince Precedency was purely of Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution, and given (as this Canon ſaith,) on conſideration of the honours of the Cities, when the Emperors had made this City equal to old *Rome*, as to the Civil State, the Council might allot it a ſuitable precedence in the Church, which was a perfecting of the Nicene Canon, and a pro-

(*q*) *Almain.* de Eccleſ. Author. cap. 7.

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 452. pag. 166.

proceeding upon the ſame reaſon; but no contradiction to it. Secondly, *Leo* argues, that this was a prejudice to the two Sees of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, which were elder Patriarchates, and ſo ought to preceed *Conſtantinople:* I reply, *Maximus* Biſhop of *Antioch* did not think this Canon any injury to him, for he is the ſecond who ſubſcribed it, and all-along in the ſeveral Seſſions *Anatolius* ſat and ſpoke before him: And though *Leo* ſtood nicely upon his points in theſe matters, we do not find other Biſhops were of that temper; they freely ſubmitted to the Biſhop of the imperial City, eſpecially ſince he only had a place before them, but no Authority over any other Patriarch: So that *Leo* need not make any objections for them, who are not found to complain, or to have thought themſelves injured. I ſhall not inſiſt upon *Leo*'s inſinuation, that this Canon was procured fraudulently, and that *Anatolius* his Pride made him ſeek it, and ſtrive to impoſe upon the Council: For every body ſees the whole Council clears him of this; and 'tis plain, *Leo* was far prouder than *Anatolius*; he ſcorned a Second, and feared in time he might prove an Equal: But *Anatolius* only got that place confirmed to him in this Council, which he and his predeceſſors had held long before: I might add here the elaborate Arguments of *Baronius* and *Binius*; but fearing I have been already too tedious, I ſhall refer the Reader to *Richerius* (who diſcovers all their Fallacies (*s*);) and make ſome obſervations on the reſt of theſe Letters after the Council. In an Epiſtle of the Emperors to the Monks of *Alexandria*, who diſliked the Council of *Chalcedon*, he recommends its definitions, as agreeing to the Faith *of* Athanaſius, Theophilus *and* Cyril, *former Biſhops of* Alexandria (*t*), which it ſeems was more conſiderable to them, than the Faith of *Leo*, in whom that Age knew of no Infallibility. Again, it is a good Rule in an Epiſtle of Leo's, *That none ſhould ſeek his own advancement by the diminution of another* (*u*), which had he and his Succeſſors obſerved they would not have degraded all the other Patriarchs

(*s*) *Richer.* Hiſt. Concil. gen. Tom. 1. cap. 8. §. 44.

(*t*) Par. 3. num. 8. *Bin.* pag. 356 *Lab.* col. 849.

(*u*) Ibid. num. 76. *Bin.* pag. 369. *Lab.* col. 882.

to ſet themſelves up as ſupreme over them all. There may be ſome ſuſpicion, whether that Epiſtle of *Leo* to *Maximus* Biſhop of *Antioch* be genuin; however there is a very improbable ſtory in it, *viz.* That *Juvenalis* of *Jeruſalem* had ſought to get the juriſdiction of all *Paleſtina* in the famous General Council of *Epheſus*, and that *Cyril* had writ to *Leo* to joyn with him in oppoſing that deſign; whereas that Council of *Epheſus* was held nine years before *Leo* was Pope (*w*); and therefore *Leo* could not be applied to, as to any thing agitated in that Council: After this follows a multitude of Epiſtles, in anſwer to the complaints of the Ægyptian Biſhops, who adhered to this Council of *Chalcedon*, and the Emperor *Leo*'s Order to all Biſhops, to give the Senſe of every Provincial Church, concerning this General Council which ſome heretical Monks had queſtioned: For this Emperor prudently avoided the charge and trouble of another General Council, appointing the Metropolitans to call their own Biſhops together at home, and to ſend him their Opinion of this Council of *Chalcedon*; which was univerſally owned by all in their ſeveral Letters, to have been an Orthodox Council, ſufficiently approved and confirmed: Now had the Pope then been infallible, or thought to be ſo, it had been ſufficient to write to him alone, and he could have told the Emperor the Senſe of the Catholick Church; but he was only writ to as other Biſhops were, to declare his own Opinion: So that in this proceeding there are no marks of his Supremacy; for the other Biſhops confirm the Faith decreed in this Council as well as the Pope, nor did his ratifying it make it needleſs for the Emperor to require the ſentiments of others.

(*w*) Ibid. num. 17. *Bin.* pag. 370. *Lab.* col. 884.

§. 5. We have no more to add to this, but only to make a few brief Remarks upon ſuch paſſages in *Binius*'s Notes upon this Council, as have not yet come under our conſideration. The Miracle of *Euphemia* the Martyrs taking the Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith into her Hand

Hand (ſo long after her Death and Burial) and caſting away that which was Heretical, is only hinted at in that ſuſpicious Epiſtle from the Council (*x*): But the Notes and *Baronius* cite, for the formal ſtory, no Author elder than *Metaphraſtes*, who lived above 450 years after; and if we conſider how he and the later Writers, who mention it, vary and contradict one another in the time and manner of this pretended Miracle (*y*), we ſhall eaſily diſcern the whole Story to be a Fiction. A little after the Notes ſay, that they *highly injure this Holy Council, who ſay the Epiſtle of* Ibas, *which is Heretical, and contains the praiſes of Hereticks, and the condemnation of the Orthodox, was received and approved by the Fathers at* Chalcedon; *for thoſe who ſay ſo joyn with the Neſtorians* (*z*). But alaſs it proves very unluckily, that it was Pope *Vigilius* who ſaid this, and who was condemned for an Heretick for this and other things of like nature, by the fifth General Council (*a*); and *Binius* knew this well enough, but becauſe it was a Friend, he conceals his Name. Again, he tells us of one *Julianus*, Biſhop of *Coos*, that he was the Popes Legate (*b*), and ſo he is called indeed in the Subſcriptions ſometimes; but let it be noted, that the Pope doth not name this *Julianus* in his Letter to the Council among his Legates (*c*); but *Paſchaſinus*, *Lucentius* and *Boniface* with one *Baſilius* are there ſaid to be his Legates: And yet this *Baſilius* never appeared in the Council, which makes a very Learned Man conjecture, that the Fathers at *Chalcedon* rejected two of thoſe whom the Pope had nominated for Legates, *viz.* this *Baſilius* and *Julianus*, the former not being admitted into the Council, and the later having no other place than what his own See gave him; ſo that *Baronius* his obſervation concerning this *Julianus* his ſpeaking Latin, as the dignity of the Roman See required, will not prove him properly a Legate, or if it do (*d*), then the Council placed the Popes Legates as they pleaſed. Moreover, the Notes call the excommunicating of the Pope by *Dioſcorus*, *ſcelus inauditum*, *an unheard-of-wickedneſs*; and alittle

(*x*) Par. 3. num. 2. *Bin.* pag. 351 *Lab.* col. 836.

(*y*) Vid. *Bin.* not. p. 410. *Lab.* col. 983.

(*z*) *Bin.* not. p. 411. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 984.

(*a*) *Crakenthorp. Vigil.* Dormit. chap. 10. p. 107.

(*b*) Not. *Bin.* p. 411. col. 2. *Lab.* ut ſupr.

(*c*) Par. 1. num. 40. *Bin.* p. 31. *Lab.* col. 70.

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 451. p. 143.

a little after they ſay, *That* Dioſcorus *was the firſt that ever was known to excommunicate the Pope, or had committed this unheard-of-wickedneſs* (*e*). But why all this? Doth the Council ſay ſuch a Fact was never attempted nor heard of before? No, that is their addition, for we have heard of Aſian and African Biſhops, who took themſelves to have as much Power to excommunicate *Victor* and *Stephen*, Biſhops of *Rome*, as they had to Excommunicate them. And we have heard of *Liberius* and *Fœlix*, whoſe Communion was renounced by the Orthodox; and therefore *Dioſcorus*'s fault was his excommunicating an Orthodox Patriarch in a pack'd, private, heretical Synod, not becauſe this Patriarch was Biſhop of *Rome*; for had *Leo* deſerved this Sentence by holding Hereſie, no doubt a greater Council would afterward have ratified it, and joyned with *Dioſcorus*. In the account which the Notes give of the third Seſſion, we are told *that* Dioſcorus *was accuſed for waſting the Goods left to the Poor, and Pious Uſes, by a Noble Lady deceaſed, ſo that no Incenſe could be offered for her Soul.* And *Binius* and *Baronius* hence infer that they uſed then to pray for the Dead (*f*). But if we look into the Council, this will appear an invention of their own; for there is no mention of praying for that Ladies Soul, or offering incenſe for it to God; but only *that* Dioſcorus *by ſpending her Gifts riotouſly, had (as much as in him lay) hindred the offering a ſweet Savour to God out of her oblation* (*g*). Now whether this ſweet Savour be meant literally of Incenſe, then uſed in Chriſtian Churches, or allegorically of Alms, (ſo called *Philip.* iv. 18.) yet ſtill there is not the leaſt intimation that either of theſe were offered for the Lady or her Soul, or any Prayers made for her after her Deceaſe. Yet this falſe Inference is nauſeouſly repeated again afterwards (*h*): In which laſt place *Binius* ſaith, Dioſcorus *his with-holding the Wheat which the Emperor gave to the Churches of* Lybia, *ſo that the terrible and unbloody Sacrifice could not be offered there, is a clear Teſtimony for the Maſs* (*i*). Whereas it is only an evidence, that the Euchariſt was made of Wheat

(*e*) *Bin.* not. p. 412. col. 1. C. & col. 2. D.

(*f*) *Bin.* not. p. 412. col. 2. E. *Lab.* col. 986. *Baron. An.* 451. p. 144.

(*g*) Act. 3. *Bin.* p. 183. *Lab.* col. 401.

(*h*) *Bin.* not. p. 417. col. 1. D. *Lab.* col. 994.

(*i*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* ibid.

Wheat, and that they received a large Morſel (as we Proteſtants do) of the Holy Bread; and when it is called *an unbloody Sacrifice*, I think that to be a Teſtimony, they did not believe the natural and true Blood of Chriſt was there by Tranſubſtantiation. It is alſo very falſe to ſay, *That after the Cauſe of* Sabinianus, Act. 14. *the Council was ended, the Aſſembly diſſolved, when the Legates and Judges went out*, and that *the Eaſtern Biſhops ſtaid behind clandeſtinly* (*k*); In which Words there are more falſhoods than Lines. For *if the Council was ended*, how came the whole Council to meet again without a new Summons, the very next day? Again, the Legates went out indeed, but it was after the Judges, not before them, as the Notes inſinuate; and the Judges went out becauſe the Cauſes were all heard, and only the Canons to be treated of; but before they went they ordered the Biſhops to make ſome Canons: So that to ſay the Council was ended, and the Synod diſſolved becauſe none but the Biſhops ſtaid, is ridiculous, and contradicts his Note upon the third Seſſion, where he makes it a moſt clear evidence of a General Council, when the Biſhops meet without Lay-Judges: If he ſay *the Popes Legates did not ſtay*; I reply, *they were deſired to ſtay*, and their peeviſh abſence could not hinder the Councils proceedings, no more than *Dioſcorus* his abſenting; and the Acts were next day approved as good, though done without them; and there it was alſo proved, that the Council did not act clandeſtinly; yea, it is very abſurd to ſay the going out of three Men from 627 who ſtaid behind, could make the Synod which remained, to be a Clandeſtine Aſſembly: So that we may wonder at the boldneſs of theſe Editors, who in ſpite to the 28*th* Canon upon falſe grounds condemn thoſe Actions which were examined, juſtified and approved by this whole General Council. We have in the next place an old Inſcription, pretended to have been made in a Chappel built by *Hilary*, the Legate of Pope *Leo*, after his wondrous eſcape from the Pſeudo-Synod of *Epheſus*, in theſe words, *To his De-*

(*k*) *Bin.* not. p. 415. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 991.

Deliverer St. John *the Evangeliſt*, Hilary, *the Biſhop and Servant of Chriſt* (*l*): Which Inſcription gives *Baronius* and the Notes occaſion to affirm, that he had prayed and made Vows to St. *John* for his Deliverance. But I ſee no reaſon to believe this Inſcription to be ſo ancient as the time of this *Hilary* (*Leo*'s Succeſſor *An.* 461.). For in his Letter extant in the Council, he relates the Story of his flight, but mentions no Saint at all, only ſaith, *he truſted in the grace of Chriſt* (*m*). And this Style which is ſo like the Pagan Vows to their little Deities, was above the Infant Superſtition of that Age; ſo that beſides the improbability of an Inſcription continuing legible for near twelve hundred years; none who knows the time of *Hilary* can believe the invocation of Saints was ſo far advanced, for a Man to forget God and Jeſus Chriſt the only Deliverers of their Servants, and publickly, yea blaſphemouſly to aſcribe his deliverance to a Creature, *Rom.* i. 25. Wherefore we conclude this Inſcription was writ by ſome later Hand in times of groſs Idolatry and Ignorance; and that this which they call an *Egregious Monument of Antiquity, and an Argument for Invocation of Saints*, is nothing elſe but an Egregious Impoſture, and an Argument to prove the Fraud of thoſe who ſet up falſe Doctrines by feigned Antiquity. 'Tis true in the 11*th* Action, when *Stephen*, whom *Flavian* had condemned in his life-time, was depoſed by the Council after his death, ſome of the Biſhops cried out, Flavian *lives after his death, the Martyr hath prayed for us* (*n*); but this is far ſhort of the aforeſaid Inſcription, for they neither vow nor pray to the Martyr; only ſince his Sentence was agreed to be juſt after his death, they Rhetorically ſay this ſeemed as if *Flavianus* had prayed for them*: Yet this (if it be genuine) is the greateſt ſtep toward Invocation of Saints that I have ſeen in any Writing of this Age; though it be no more than a Flouriſh, proceeding from an exceſs of Admiration of *Flavianus*, ſo lately martyred by *Dioſcorus*, the Mortal Enemy of this Council. Concerning which *Dioſcorus* (for likeneſs of

(*l*) *Bin.* not. p. 415. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 992. *Baron. An.* 449. p. 96.

(*m*) Par. 1. num. 24. *Bin.* p. 23. *Lab.* col. 52.

(*n*) Act. 11. *Bin.* p. 304. *Lab.* col. 697.

* Vide ap. D. *Crakenth.* in Spalat. c. 59. p. 383.

of the Subject) I obſerve the Notes ſay, *the Ægyptians gave him* (oh horrible) *Divine Honours, and Religious Worſhip after his Death* (o); which means no more, as *Baronius* (the Author of the Story) ſaith, but that *they worſhipped him as a Saint, and gave him ſuch Religious Worſhip as they give to Saints* (p). Now the wary Romaniſts will not ſay theſe are *Divine Honours*, much leſs were they ſuch Honours, as were paid to any Saints in this Age, or ſome that followed: But when Modern Writers ſpeak of Ancient Times, they often ſpeak in Modern Phraſes; and ſo *Binius* took it to be the ſame thing to honour *Dioſcorus* as a Saint, and to give him Religious Worſhip, becauſe they at *Rome* now give Religious Worſhip to thoſe they Canonize.

(o) *Bin.* not. p. 419. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 998.

(p) *Baron. An.* 452. p. 168.

And this may ſuffice for this famous Council, wherein *Leo* (being all along Orthodox, while the Patriarchs of moſt other great Sees had been either faulty or ſuſpected) had the greateſt advantage imaginable to carry on his great Deſign of ſetting up for the Supremacy; and though by this accident, which he and his Legates improved, higher Titles are given him, than to any of his Predeceſſors or Succeſſors for ſome Ages in any Council; yet if the Forgeries and Corruptions be abated, and the Fallacious Notes well underſtood, there is no ground from any thing here ſaid or done, to think the Fathers at *Chalcedon* took this Pope for the ſole, ſupreme and viſible Head of the Catholick Church.

An Appendix concerning Baronius's Annals.

§. 1. THIS Century proving ſo full of various obſervations as to ſwell beyond our expectations, we muſt here divert a-while, to view the Errors in *Baronius*, leſt the deferring theſe Obſervations to the laſt, ſhould make the Reader forget the Series of affairs already paſt, by laying theſe matters too far from the Hiſtory of that time to which theſe Notes belong; and for brevity ſake, as well as for the clearer ſeeing into this Authors Fallacies, we will follow our former Method.

And firſt we will obſerve, that when he would ſet up any Doctrines, or juſtifie any Practices of the Modern Corrupt Roman Church, he generally cites ſpurious Authors, or ſuch as writ ſo long after this time, that their Teſtimony is juſtly ſuſpected, ſince no Authors of this Age do mention any ſuch thing.

The Miracle of *Julia*, a Manichean Heretick Woman, ſtruck dead by *Porphyrius*, Biſhop of *Gaza*, when he could not convert her by Arguments, is taken out of a Latin Copy aſcribed to one *Mark*, a Deacon of *Gaza*, very improbably; but the ſtreſs of the Evidence lies upon the Credit of *Metaphraſtes*, *Lipoman* and *Surius* the Collectors of Legends, who trade in few others but ſpurious Authors (*q*). It were to be wiſhed we had ſome better evidence of St. *Ambroſe*'s appearing after his death, and promiſing Victory over the *Goths*, than a Womans Teſtimony: For both *Oroſius* and St. *Auguſtin*, who write of that Victory, aſcribe it wholly to the Power of God, and mention no Saint concerned therein. And *Baronius* cites both theſe, as well as the credulous *Paulinus*, who for advancing the credit of St.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 403. pag. 179.

St. *Ambroſe*, records an Old-Wives Tale, not ſupported by any credible evidence (*r*). The ridiculous ſtory of St. *Paul*'s appearing to St. *Chryſoſtom*, who is pretended to have had the Picture of St. *Paul* in his Study, and to have diſcourſed with the ſenſleſs Image, is not proved by any Author near that Age, but by *Leo* the Philoſopher and Emperor, who lived 500 year after, and writ a very Fabulous Hiſtory of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life; and by a ſpurious Tract of *Damaſcens*, who lived 450 year after *Chryſoſtom*'s Death (*s*). Yet upon theſe falſe Legends the Annaliſt triumphs over thoſe who oppoſe Image-worſhip. Like to this, is that fabulous Story of *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, not being able to die in peace till the Image of St. *Chyſoſtom* was brought to him, and he had adored it (*t*); which he hath no other Authority for, than the aforeſaid ſpurious Book aſcribed to a late Author *Damaſcen*; for the Writers of this Age mention no ſuch thing: And there can be no doubt but the Relation is falſe, becauſe St. *Cyril*, *Theophilus* his Nephew and Succeſſor continued for ſome time to have as ill an opinion of St. *Chryſoſtom*, as his Uncle had to his laſt breath, as his Letter to *Atticus* (in *Baronius*) (*u*) ſhews: And therefore there is a Story invented of a Viſion appearing to St. *Cyril*, by which he was terrified into a good opinion of St. *Chryſoſtom*: But though the Quarrel he had at firſt to his memory be real, this Apparition is feigned, and proved by no elder nor better Authors (*w*) than *Nicetus* and *Nicephorus*. Another Forgery of St. *Cyril*'s removing the Relicts of St. *Mark*, and other Saints into a Church, newly built in place of an Idol-temple, and thereby clearing it from Evil Spirits, hath no better Authority than certain Legends read in that woful Council of *Nice*, which ſet up Image-worſhip 300 year after this Age (*x*). The Revelation of the Relicks of St. *Stephen*, pretended to be writ by *Lucian*, is tranſcribed by the Annaliſt, but it contains many improbable lies, and frivolous impertinencies, ſuch as *Gamaliel* (the Maſter of St. *Paul*) being a Prieſt, and that St. *Stephen*'s body was expoſed

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 406. p. 238. *I wiſh he had remembred here his own words,* Non enim indigent Sancti noſtris illuſtrari mendaciis, Ibid. p. 262.

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 407. p. 256.

(*t*) *Baron. An.* 412. p. 345.

(*u*) Id. ibid. p. 348.

(*w*) Id. ibid. p. 351.

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 414. p. 365.

to Wild Beasts by the command of Wicked Princes, and that the way to engage St. *Stephen*, *Gamaliel* and the rest to interceed for them, was to build a Chappel over their Relicks, with many more absurd passages: So that indeed it is fitter to be derided, or left to the Moths and Batts, than to stand in a Church History (*y*). He cites for this one of St. *Augustin*'s Sermons *de diversis*; but it is supposititious, and therefore can be no evidence for this Fable (*z*): And it is a mighty prejudice to the whole Relation, that St. *Hierom*, who lived at *Bethlehem* at this very time, doth not confirm it, no not in his fierce discourse against the mistaken Opinion of *Vigilantius*, who (as he thought) denied even common respect to be shewed to the Bones of Martyrs: And it is like *Sozomen* did not like the story, because he ends his History with a promise to give an Account of the invention of these Relicks of St. *Stephen*, but he omits it (*a*); Though he writes out another Legend there of the finding the Body of *Zechary* the Prophet, of which he brings no other proof, but that he had been told this Story (*b*). But it is very unlikely, that the Jews should have no regard to the Bodies of their own Prophets, nor know of any vertue in them, and yet after so many hundred years, the Christians should find such power in their supposed Dust; And it is one of the greatest Blots upon the latter end of this Century, that their Superstition made them too credulous and apt to be imposed on with Fables of this kind, in which there is scarce any verisimilitude, or shadow of probability: Which led the following Ages into greater Errors, and had worse effects than were foreseen by those easie and well-meaning writers, who hastily took up these false reports: Which Note I am obliged to insert here, to caution the Reader against divers relations of Miracles in *Baronius* about this time, for some of which he cites Authors, who are in other things credible enough (*c*). To proceed, it is no great credit for the Pope, that he and the Western Bishops mistook the time of *Easter* a whole Month,

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 415. pag. 367.

(*z*) Serm. 51. vid. *Rivet.* censur. lib. 4. cap. 16.

(*a*) *Sozom.* Hist. lib. 9. cap. 17.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 415. pag. 382.

(*c*) Vid. *Baron. An.* 416. pag. 390 & alib. passim.

Month, and were reproved by a miraculous appearance of Water in the Font on the right day of *Eaſter*, if the ſtory be true (*d*): However to confirm this relation, *Baronius* hath put together a great many ſuch like Miracles, but writ by later Authors, (*Caſſiodorus An.* 514. *Gregory Turonenſis An.* 590. *Sophronius An.* 630.) when all Men doted on theſe reports: But it is a little hard, that he ſhould charge the Reformed Chriſtians with being mad, for not believing theſe ſuſpicious relations, and accuſe them with deriding the conſecration of baptiſmal Water (*e*); which is a known practice in all regular Proteſtant Churches. A litle after he would prove the antiquity of the Maſs by a ſpurious Sermon, falſly aſcribed to St. *Auguſtin*, viz. *de temp. Ser.* 251. (*f*): And he tranſcribes a ſuſpicious Epiſtle full of improbable Stories for nine pages together, about the Miracles wrought by St. *Stevens* Relicks, which Epiſtle he would prove by another Tract equally fabulous, which ſome ſay, was writ by *Evodius* an African Biſhop; others think it was only dedicated to him, in which are *Domnus* and *Domna* (after the Gallican Faſhion in later Ages) for *Dominus* and *Domina*: But the judicious Reader who compares theſe Legends with other writings of this learned Age, will eaſily diſcern both theſe Tracts to be Forgeries of the modern ſuperſtitious Times (*g*): So that perhaps one Miracle-monger made them both. And *Baronius* had juſtified neither of them, if he had remembred what himſelf ſays of a ſpurious Tract of the Acts of St. *Hierom*, viz. *That the candor of Eccleſiaſtical truth, and the modeſty of Chriſtian ſincerity, abhors always that which is feigned, rejects and accurſes all that is ſpurious*; *The true Faith always bitterly hating and ſeverely puniſhing every lye with the Author of it* (*h*): But his practice is every where contrary to this profeſſion. And ſoon after he cites the Lives of the Fathers, under *Theodoret*'s name, to prove the efficacy of St. *John Baptiſt*'s prayers, as to the Converſion of the Marcionites, whereas the Epiſtle of *Theodoret* there cited, aſcribes it to *the divine ayd* (*i*). And this fabulous Book of the Lives

(*d*) *An.* 417. pag. 406.

(*e*) *Baron. An.* 417 pag. 407.

(*f*) *Baron. An.* 418. pag. 418. vid. *Rivet.* cenſur. lib. 4. c. 16.

(*g*) *Baron. An.* 418. pag. 419 ad 428. col. lat. com *Baron. An.* 416. pag. 390. & *Coci* cenſur. pag. 205.

(*h*) *Baron. An.* 420. pag. 473.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 424. pag. 487.

Lives of the Fathers is deſpicable for its groſs abſurdities, and can be none of *Theodorets*, becauſe it contains many Miracles, that *Simeon Stylites* wrought after his death; and *Baronius* himſelf owns, That *Theodoret* dyed ſeven year before this *Simeon* (*k*): Yet this is the Man who is ſo ſevere an Enemy to all feigned Tracts, who again, cites the Rules for conjugal Chaſtity as preſcribed by St. *Auguſtin*, but finds them only in a forged Sermon, (*de Temp. pag.* 244. falſly aſcribed to that modeſt Father (*l*); Wherein there is ſo much Obſcenity, as cannot be ſuppoſed to proceed out of St. *Auguſtin's* mouth in publick, and ſuch as is hardly fit for Chriſtian Ears: beſides many things that would be hiſſed at in any ſober Auditory (*m*). Again, he cites *Sophronius* his *Pratum ſpirituale*, as a Book of good credit, and relating an Apparition of the Bleſſed Virgin as it truly happened (*n*): Whereas both *Poſſevine* and *Baronius* himſelf confeſs this Book to be full of Fables, and of no credit (*o*); and the Author of it lived above 200 year after, in a credulous and ignorant, as well as a ſuperſtitious Age, whoſe name was not *Sophronius*, but *Joannes Moſchus*: Upon whoſe credit he would not have relied ſo much, had he obſerved a rule of his own, *That he who writes the Hiſtory of his own time is of greater Authority, than he who writes after many Ages* (*p*); Which Rule he breaks in the very next Page, by juſtifying a Legend writ by *Gregory*, the Author of the Dialogues, long after the year 600, and cited by *Eulogius* of *Corduba*, *An.* 847. concerning *Paulinus* of *Nola*, who died *An.* 431. as a Writer of *Paulinus* own Age teſtifies there (*q*): Whereas if this Fable were true, (as thoſe late Writers relate it) *Paulinus* muſt be alive 45 years after; ſo that he credits later Writers in contradiction to thoſe of the ſame Age. We have often ſeen modern Authors deſcribing the holy Men of this and former Ages, with Images, Crucifixes, &c. but *Conſtantius*, who about this time writ the life of St. *Germanus*, mentions no Images or Crucifix among that which he left at his death, but only a Box of Relicks, the ſole point wherein Superſtion was

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 453. & *An.* 460. vid. *Coci* cenſuram. pag. 207.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 428. pag 508.

(*m*) Vid. *Coci* cenſur. pag. 198.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 429. pag. 524.

(*o*) Vid *Coci* cenſur. pag. 228.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 604.

(*q*) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 605.

was advanced as yet (*r*). And whereas late Writers of the Saints Lives ſpeak of Addreſſes to the Bleſſed Virgin, to deceaſed Saints, *&c.* this old Author mentions only Prayers to God; for thoſe other kind of Prayers were not uſed in this Age. A little after he tells more Fables about the tranſlation of the Relicks of St. *Stephen* to *Conſtantinople* out of late and unfaithful Authors, ſuch as *Cedrenus*, *Nicephorus*, *Nicetus*, &c. but he himſelf obſerves, that they do not agree as to the time, nor the quantity of the Relicks tranſlated (*s*): And this diſagreement ſhould have made him ſuſpect the whole for an Impoſture. And if the Reader conſider what incredible Stories are told of the Miracles wrought by the Relicks of this one Martyr, in *Sardinia*, *Africk*, *Spain*, *Paleſtine* and *Conſtantinople*, &c. he muſt believe they cut his Body into as many pieces as there were Stones thrown at him, and will wonder how the Body could become whole again, and be intirely tranſlated out of *Paleſtine* in the year 439. What *Theodoret* relates of one African Virgin Captive, may be believed to be true, and that Relation hath no Miracle in it: But when *Ado*, of *Vienna*, writ the Acts of another Virgin, called *Julia*, captivated at the ſame time, he hath ſtuffed the Story with Miracles (*t*); and the only reaſon of this difference is, that this later Author writ his Martyrology, *Anno* 850, that is, above 406 year after, when Legends grew to be more in Faſhion. The Annaliſt takes great pains to prove certain Homilies (which ſome aſcribe to *Euſebius Emiſſenus*, others to *Fauſtus Rhegienſis*, others to *Cæſarius* of *Arles*) to be the work of *Eucherius*, Biſhop of *Lyons*; but as the Author is uncertain, the matter of them is juſtly to be condemned, being full of Superſtitions, and ſome that came not in till the corrupter and later Ages (*u*). However, *Baronius* was obliged to get theſe Homilies aſcribed to ſome Writer of good repute, ſince many of the evil Practices and Errors of their Church (*w*), which cannot be juſtified by known and genuine Authors, are defended by ſuch obſcure Tracts as this.

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 435. p. 652, 654.

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 439. p. 667.

(*t*) *Baron. An.* 440. Tom. 6. p. 6.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 441. p. 8.

(*w*) Vid. *Coci* cenſur p. 117, 118. *Rivet.* Crit. Sacr. lib. 1. c. 20.

Again,

Again, we have a very abſurd Story of St. *Cyril*'s convincing a Monk that *Melchiſedech* was not the Son of God, by a Revelation made to the Monk himſelf, who had fallen into that Error (*x*): But that Fable of *Cyril*'s being a Monk upon Mount *Carmel*, is ſo groſs, that he rejects it with this Note, *That a vehement deſire to ſeem of Antient Extraction, makes Men ſometimes to dote* (*y*); which Remark is moſt true of almoſt all the Monaſtick Orders of the Roman Church; for *Aventinus*, an excellent Hiſtorian, of their own Communion, affirms, *he had diſcovered the Monks were wont to delight the Minds of the vile Populace with feigned Tales, invented for gain, to make the Original of their Temples more Noble and Auguſt* (*z*). He brings in a ridiculous Story of an Image of the Bleſſed Virgin, found in a Cypreſs Tree, and of a Church built in the place by one *Cyrus*, Biſhop of *Smirna*; but the credit of this relies only upon *Nicephorus*, a modern and fabulous Author. And at the ſame place he brings in a Fiction of an Image of our Saviour, wounded by a Jew, but he knows not when this matter hapned; he thinks not till after the ſecond Nicene Council; but why then doth he mention it in this Age? No doubt to abuſe his Reader into a belief that Images were then in uſe. But the Story it ſelf is all over Legend, and not more Authentick for being recorded in their publick Monuments, and read in ſome Churches in the corrupt Ages (*a*), in which there are the groſſeſt Romances imaginable. A little after he taxeth *Nicephorus* for unfaithfulneſs and great miſtakes in his Relations; yet immediately he cites him as good evidence for *Relicks belonging to the Bleſſed Virgin* (*b*). In the next year we have two ridiculous Stories, the one of St. *Stephens* praying to St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* to ſpare his Chappel, when *Mets* was ſack'd and burn'd by the *Hunns* (*c*); the other of a Drunken Man, ſhut up all Night in St. *Peter*'s Church at *Rome*, and heard St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* talking together: But telling their Diſcourſe next morning, he was ſtruck blind (*d*). Upon which laſt Miracle, *Baronius* gathers, *that blind Men*

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 444. p. 19.

(*y*) Id. ibid. p. 21.

(*z*) *Aventin.* Annal. lib. 3. p. 225.

(*a*) *Baron. An.* 446. p. 39.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 450. p. 117.

(*c*) Id. An 451. p. 134.

(*d*) Id. ibid. p. 137.

Men may ſee great benefits are received by the interceſſion of Saints. But I ſhould rather think, he was blind indeed that could not diſcern theſe to be meer Fables; and truly the only Author he cites for them is *Gregory Turonenſis*, who lived 150 year after, and is full of theſe Fictions, contradicting even *Salvian*, who lived in that Country at this very time. But it is obſervable, that the Writers of the Lives of St. *Lupus* and *Anianus* (cited in this very place) do mention theſe Holy Men as *praying only to God in theſe Calamities* (*e*): For the direct invocation of Saints was not uſed, no not when thoſe Lives were written. Again, after the Council of *Chalcedon* had been confirmed by the moſt Legal and Authentick ways, it is very ridiculous in this great Annaliſt to cite ſo many frivolous Stories out of Legends, how ſome Ignorant and Enthuſiaſtical Monks confirmed it, or were convinced by Miracles, that it was a Genuine and Orthodox Council (*f*): For he cites no better Author than *Surius* for theſe Fables, yet relates them with great confidence; but this Cauſe needs no ſuch evidence.

(*e*) Id. ibid. p. 135, 136, 137.

(*f*) *Baron.* ibid. p. 160, 161, &c.

§. 2. *Secondly*, We will note ſome paſſages in genuine Authors, which he hath corrupted to ſerve a turn: He that reads *Baronius* his Note in the year 402. *that it was an Ancient Cuſtom to paint the Saints in the Churches, and that they uſe to worſhip them, with kindling Lamps before them* (*g*), would imagine this Superſtition was ancient in the beginning of the Fifth Century; whereas the Author he cites for this is *Venantius Fortunatus*, who lived till the year 600. that is, 200 year after, and though he ſpeak of a Picture drawn on a Wall, and a Lamp beſide it, doth not mention that *as any worſhip to the Picture*, that is *Baronius*'s own addition. Again, when he cites a Law of *Theodoſius* prohibiting the Jews to burn any Croſs in contempt of Chriſtianity, he adds, *that they burnt the Croſs together with our Saviour crucified on it* (*b*); but that is his own invention; the cuſtom of making a Croſs alone being indeed very ancient,

(*g*) *Baron. An.* 402. p. 163.

(*h*) *Baron. An.* 408. p. 272.

but the adding the Figure of our Saviour to it, which they call properly a *Crucifix*, is but a late device, and ſeems not at all to be referred to in that Law. To proceed, he makes *Syneſius* a notorious diſſembler, when he declares *he had moſt ſolemnly proteſted to* Theophilus, *who was to conſecrate him Biſhop of* Ptolemais, *that he would not accept that Order, unleſs he might live with his Wife as before time* (*i*). Now whoever reads that Letter may ſee that *Syneſius* profeſſes he tells truth in this relation; yea, he ſolemnly calls God and Men to witneſs, that it is true; he obſerves *Truth is one of God's Attributes, and moſt pleaſing to him:* Yet *Baronius* will have him to uſe the Art of Lying, in all theſe proteſtations, becauſe forſooth he cannot think *Theophilus* would ordain a Biſhop, who ſhould live with, and have Children by his Wife; that is, he meaſures the Primitive Church (in which there were divers Biſhops married) by their Modern Corrupt Roman Standard. And this ſincere Father muſt be made to mock God, and deceive Men, and expoſed as a Notorious Liar and Diſſembler, rather than there ſhould ſeem to be any difference between the Primitive Church and theirs in the point of the Clergies Marriage. Again, he obſerves out of St. *Auguſtin* (*k*), *that he accounted the Council of* Sardica *heretical, becauſe* Julius, *Biſhop of* Rome, *was condemned there*; and he infers, *that whatever was ſaid or done againſt the Pope was of evil Fame among the Antients* (*l*): But if St. *Auguſtin* had not been miſrepreſented, there had been no room for this fallacious Note. St. *Auguſtin* blames this Council (in the ſecond place cited) as heretical for condemning *Athanaſius*, and doth not mention Pope *Julius* there at all; and in the former place he names *Athanaſius* firſt, and *Julius* only in the ſecond place; and he blames them not for condemning him as Biſhop of *Rome*, but becauſe he was Orthodox, as *Athanaſius* was. Wherefore *Baronius* leaves out the main part of St. *Auguſtin*'s Argument, only to bring in a falſe and flattering Inference for the Popes Supremacy. And I have obſerved before, he

(*i*) *Syneſ.* epiſt. 105. *Baron. An.* 410. p. 309, 310. 311.

(*k*) *Aug.* ep. 163. Tom. 2. fol. 153 & Tom. 7. contr. *Creſc.* l. 3. f. 57.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 412. p. 336.

he falſly gathers, that the Roman Church was the ſole Standard of Catholick Communion in *Cecilian*'s time, from a place where St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, Cecilian *of* Carthage, *was a Catholick, becauſe he was in Communion with the Roman Church, and other Lands from whence the Goſpel came into Africa* (*m*); that is, he was in Communion with the Eaſtern as well as the Weſtern Church. But *Baronius* is ſo dazled with *Rome*, that where that is found in any Sentence, he can ſee nothing elſe: And therefore when he cites this very place again a little after, he would prove *that* Carthage *owned a right in the Roman Church to receive Appeals*, and this, contrary to the expreſs Proteſtation of that African Council, wherein St. *Auguſtin* was preſent; and the place it ſelf doth not mention any Appeals, and ſpeaks of Communion with other Churches as well as *Rome* (*n*); and ſo would equally prove a right in other Biſhops as well as the Pope, to receive Appeals from *Africa*, if that had been ſpoken of there. Further, from *Socrates* his relation of a Biſhop of *Cyzicum*, named by *Siſinnius*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, but not received, by reaſon of their miſtaking a late Law made to confirm the Priviledges of that See of *Conſtantinople*, and this in the time of a mild and quiet Biſhop; he infers, *that this Patriarch challenged no right, no not in* Helleſpont, *by the Canon of any General Council* (*o*). Now his naming a Biſhop for this City, ſhews he challenged a right, which was well known to be his due, both by the Canon of the ſecond General Council, and by this late Law; but a peaceable Mans receding from his right, after he hath made his claim, rather than provoke a Factious City, is no proof there was no right, as *Baronius* doth pretend. I obſerve alſo, that the Latin Verſion of an Epiſtle to the Council of *Epheſus*, hath theſe words, *cujus Reliquias præſentes veneramini*: Which is to abuſe the Reader into an apprehenſion, that the Relicks of St. *John* were worſhipped in that Age (*p*): But the Greek word is, τιμωμένας (*q*), which imports no more than that they were *honoured*, which is far leſs than that which *Rome* now

(*m*) *Aug.* ep. 162. fol. 150. *Baron. An.* 412. p. 356.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 419. p. 450.

(*o*) *Baron. An.* 426. p. 494.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 531. p. 560.

(*q*) *Bin.* Tom. 1. par. 2. p. 234.

gives even to feigned Relicks of uncertain Saints. A like Falſhood about the People of *Epheſus worſhipping the Bleſſed Virgin*, I noted before (*r*). Again, he manifeſtly perverts a Phraſe of *Theodoſius*, the Eaſtern Emperor, in his Epiſtle to *Acacius*, where he adviſes the Neſtorians to ſhew themſelves *approved Biſhops of the Roman Religion* (*s*); which *Baronius* pretends, reſpects the Weſtern Church of Old *Rome* in *Italy*; but the Emperor plainly refers to his own Empire in the *Eaſt*, which was then generally Orthodox, and againſt *Neſtorius*: *Conſtantinople* is often called *Rome*, without any other addition; and *Romania*, or the Roman Empire, is in many Authors of theſe Ages, put only for the Eaſtern part of it. It is alſo very odd, that he ſhould cite *Baſil*'s Epiſtles to prove that the Roman Church was wont to ſend Legates to regulate Affairs in the Eaſtern Churches (*t*): Whereas St. *Baſil* in many Epiſtles grievouſly complains of the Pride of the *Weſt*, and of their deſpiſing the Calamities of the *Eaſt*, not ſo much as giving them that Brotherly Aid, which they might expect, when they were in great diſtreſs; but there is not one ſyllable of any juriſdiction which the Pope then did ſo much as pretend to over thoſe Eaſtern Churches. *Leo* was the firſt who ventured to make any ſteps towards this Uſurpation, an hundred years after St. *Baſil*'s time. To this device we may add his ſilent paſſing by all that makes againſt the Roman Church; but being large in his Notes upon any thing which ſeems to make for it, How many words doth he every where uſe when one is deſcribed to be Orthodox, for communicating with an Orthodox Pope? but when thoſe are declared to be Orthodox who communicated with the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch* (at that time differing from the Pope) (*u*), we have not one obſervation of the honour of thoſe Sees. Thus though he cite innumerable heretical and illiterate Writings, meerly to confirm ſome incredible Miracle or ſuperſtitious Practice, without any Cenſure paſſed on them; yet when he comes to mention the *Imperfect work on St.*

(*r*) Vid. ſupr. p. 37.

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 437. p. 620.

(*t*) *Baron.* Tom. 6. *An.* 450. p. 116.

(*u*) *Baron.* Tom. 5. *An.* 404. p. 202.

St. Mathew, *aſcribed to St.* Chryſoſtom (which many Roman Writers highly commend, as writ by a Catholick, Antient and Learned Author) (*w*), he falls into a fit of railing againſt it, as Heretical, and what not, becauſe in that Book we are told, *The Scripture is the only rule by which true Chriſtians may judge of the right Faith* (*x*): Which Sentence, though it condemn the new Romiſh way, yet it is agreeable to the Primitive and moſt Orthodox Fathers, who very often ſay the ſame thing. *And *Baronius* relates a little before, that a certain Biſhop who wrought Miracles, and converted many Pagans, charged his new Converts to apply themſelves diligently to read the Holy Scriptures. Moreover he brings in a Quotation out of St. *Auguſtin*, with a long Preface, becauſe he deſigns to miſapply it to juſtifie the Roman Supremacy: But the place it ſelf plainly ſuppoſes the Weſtern to be but one part of the Catholick Church; only he thinks the Authority of Latin Fathers alone, and of *Innocent*, a Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, Chief of this Weſtern Church, might ſuffice his Adverſary (who was one of the Latin Church). And as to *Innocent*'s Opinion he might be ſure it would agree with what the African Councils had declared, and the Roman Church conſtantly held with other Churches (*y*): Where we ſee *Innocent* is only ſet out as the firſt in Order of Dignity in the Weſtern Church, and his Opinion ſuppoſed to be right, not becauſe of the Infallibility of his See, or any Supream Power in him to judge in matters of Faith, but becauſe he agreed with the African and other Churches; and now *de Facto* took the Orthodox Side: Wherefore when *Zoſimus*, and other ſucceeding Popes favoured theſe Pelagians, the Dignity of his See did not ſecure them from the Cenſures of the African Fathers, as we ſhewed before.

(*w*) Vid. *Rivet.* Critic. Sacr. l. 4. c. 1. p. 351.

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 407. p. 255.

* An. 401. p. 137.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 419. p. 444. ex *Aug.* contra *Julian.* l. 1. c. 4.

§. 3.

§. 3. We paſs thirdly to his rare faculty of ſuppoſing things without any proof, and ſometimes making inferences from his own inventions, for the advantage of *Rome:* So when a few perſecuted Eaſtern Biſhops of *Chryſoſtom*'s party fled to the Roman Church to avoid the Storm, their own Patriarchs being all combined againſt them, *Baronius* ſaith, *they fled to it as to their Mother, being admoniſhed by the examples of their Predeceſſors:* And he goes on to inſinuate a very falſe thing, *viz.* That *all the Biſhops who were perſecuted by the Arrians in* Conſtantin's *time, in the* Eaſt, *fled to* Rome (z). Whereas only ſome few came both then and now, and dire neceſſity had left them no choice, nor other refuge. Thus he reſolves *Ruffinus* ſhall be a Pelagian Heretick; and out of a Council whoſe Acts are not extant, and the relation of it only ſaith, *Celeſtius* was condemned there; he will have *Ruffinus* condemned in that Council upon meer conjecture, and can no other ways prove him a Heretick, but by one Witneſs, even this Heretick *Celeſtius*, who being in a ſtrait, cited *Ruffinus*'s words, but probably very falſly (*a*); ſo that one Heretick ſhall be ſufficient evidence againſt a man that *Baronius* hates; but many Orthodox Witneſſes will not perſuade him that *Innocent* favoured the Pelagians almoſt to the end of his Life. It is an odd conjecture that St. *Hierom* would not tranſlate any of *Theophilus* his Paſchal Epiſtles, after once he differed with Pope *Innocent* about reſtoring St. *Chryſoſtom's* name into the Dypticks (*b*): For except another gueſs of his own, without any manner of evidence (*c*), there is no appearance that ever St. *Hierom* was concerned for St. *Chryſoſtom*'s ſufferings; and it is certain he was kind with his Mortal Enemy *Theophilus* in the year of Chriſt 404, when he got him to be baniſhed; and it would be very ſtrange that St. *Hierom* ſhould refuſe to tranſlate any more of *Theophilus*'s Epiſtles, on the account of a quarrel between him and Pope *Innocent* about reſtoring *Chryſoſtom*'s name into the Dypticks, ſince the laſt Paſchal Epiſtle tranſlated by *Hierom*,

(z) *Baron. An.* 404. p. 207.

(a) *Baron. An.* 412. p. 339, 340.

(b) *Baron.* ibid. p. 346.

(c) Idem *An.* 404. p. 223.

Hierom, was writ *Anno* 404; and *Baronius* ſaith, *Theophilus* writ every year one till *Anno* 412, but *Chryſoſtom* died not till *Anno* 407; and *Innocent* himſelf did not quarrel with *Theophilus* till long after the year 404: So that the Cardinal contradicts himſelf, meerly to ſupport an idle conjecture, *viz.* That all Eminent Fathers loved and hated only thoſe who were loved and hated by the Pope: And into what Abſurdities and Contradictions this Fancy hath led him, may be ſeen by comparing thoſe two places aforecited together; and we may note, that though it be certain *Theophilus* died unreconciled to *Chryſoſtom*'s memory, or to *Innocent*, yet *Baronius* ſhews he was commended as *a moſt approved Biſhop* (*d*), for ſo it ſeems a man might be, though he had a difference with the Biſhop of *Rome*. Again, it is a bare ſuppoſition, that the Priviledges of the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* aſſerted in the Province of *Illiricum*, by a Law of *Theodoſius*, was founded upon the falſe ſuggeſtions of *Atticus* (*e*): For the very Law it ſelf forbids innovations, and requires the ancient Canons and Cuſtoms, thus far obſerved, ſhould be in force, on which *Theodoſius* plainly grounds the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in this Province: So that he refers to the Canon of the Second General Council of *Conſtantinople*, and the uſage ever ſince; and how could this proceed from any falſe ſuggeſtions of *Atticus*?

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 412. p. 346.

(*e*) *Baron. An.* 421. p. 475.

To proceed, *Proſper* relating *Germanus* his going into *Britain*, as ſome think, miſtakes the time at leaſt ſeventeen years (*f*), and ſays nothing of St. *Lupus* his Companion in that Journey; howbeit, becauſe *Proſper* ſaith the Pope ſent St. *Germanus*, *Baronius* will have him to be authentick, contrary to all other Authors (*g*), who affirm St. *Germanus* and *Lupus* were ſent by a Gallican Council, to whom a Petition from the Britiſh Biſhops was ſent: However he affirms it for a certainty ſoon after (*h*), that St. *Germanus* was the Popes Legate into *Britain*, which he had but half proved before. And one Author, who ſpeaks favourably of the Popes Authority,

(*f*) Vid. *Spelm.* Concil. Tom. 1. p. 48.

(*g*) *Baron. An.* 429. p. 520.

(*h*) Ibid. p. 523.

thority, ſhall be believed againſt many of equal Credit who ſpeak otherwiſe: I grant *Proſper* is a credible Writer; only he is apt, for the credit of the Cauſe, always to bring in the Popes as Enemies to the Pelagians, ſometimes without reaſon; and *Conſtantine*, *Bede* with others who write of this journey into *Britain*, and aſcribe this miſſion to a French Council, deſerve more credit in that particular than he. A little after, upon *Cyril*'s mentioning *Neſtorius*'s *writing to the Roman Biſhop, in hopes to draw him to his Opinion*: *Baronius* ſuppoſes of his own Head, that *it was an ancient uſe in Controverſies of Faith to write to the Biſhop of* Rome, *and that the part he choſe was generally favoured*; *ſo that if* Neſtorius *could perſuade him, the whole Catholick Church would follow his Judgment* (*i*); which is all Chimæra, for Pope *Victor*, *Stephen* and *Liberius* of old, *Vigilius* and *Honorius* afterward, found oppoſition enough (for all the dignity of their place) when they ſeemed to other Biſhops to take the wrong ſide. From a fabulous Writer called *Probus* (*k*), who hath given us a Legend of St. *Patrick*'s Life; he not only confidently affirms that Pope *Celeſtine* ſent this *Patrick* to convert the Iriſh, but infers from thence, *That it was clear to all men, the Goſpel was to be received from the Apoſtolical See for the converſion of the Pagans* (*l*). Whereas it is not clear that St. *Patrick* was ſent from *Rome*; but it is clear, that other Heathen Countries have received the Goſpel by the care of other Patriarchs and Eminent Biſhops; ſo that his Ground is but conjecture, and the Superſtructure wholly vain. 'Tis true indeed, that Pope *Leo*, to ſhew his Authority, deſired three Biſhops of *Sicily* to appear in his annual Roman Council once a year, and was the firſt Pope who put this Yoke upon them; but how this new encroachment *ſhews the ancient obſervance of holding Councils of Biſhops twice a year, is very hard to conjecture* (*m*): only when a Pope alters the Fathers Cuſtoms, the Annaliſt will ſuppoſe he obſerves and confirms them: And he could ſee no uſurpation in this Popes calling the Sicilian Biſhops yearly to *Rome*, againſt the

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 430. p. 532.

(*k*) Vid. *Uſh.* Antiq. Brit. c. 17. p. 426.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 431. p. 605.

(*m*) *Baron. An.* Tom. 6. An. 447. p. 49.

the ancient Uſage. But when *Dioſcorus* of *Alexandria* would have encroached upon the Biſhops of *Syria*, he blames him ſeverely (*n*). We ſhall not mention the Authority of the Writings of *Athanaſius*, *Cyril* and other Eminent Biſhops of other Sees, in Controverſies of Faith: But it is very impoſing for *Baronius* to ſuppoſe, *The Pope preſided as the Maſter over the whole Chriſtian World, and out of his high Throne taught all men the Catholick Faith*(o); and all this only, becauſe *Leo* had the good Fortune (by his Secretary *Proſper*'s help) to write one Orthodox Epiſtle againſt *Eutyches* in a lucky time, when a Council was to be called to condemn that Hereſie: As to the Author of it *Eutyches*, it was always a Rule in the Church to receive even the Inventors of Hereſies, if they would renounce their Errors: So that for *Leo* to ſay (in his Letter to the Council of *Chalcedon*) he thought they might deal ſo with *Eutyches*, is no manner of ground for *Baronius* to ſuppoſe, that this was *a ſpecial Favour indulged to that General Council by the Pope, contrary to Eccleſiaſtical Laws and Cuſtoms* (p). For it is well known, that a General Council in that Age gave Laws to the Pope, but did not receive any from him; and whatever *Leo*'s Opinion might be, the Council were ſole Judges of the terms on which *Eutyches* was to be reſtored; and had he Recanted they would have received him into Communion by their own Authority, ſince *Arius*, *Neſtorius* and *Pelagius* had that Favour offered them by former Councils, and *Eutyches* would have found the like Kindneſs here, if the Pope had ſaid nothing at all of the matter: Wherefore the *Annaliſt* hath crouded many Falſhoods into a few Lines only, to perſuade his weak Readers, That the Pope was above a General Council. And to make him ſeem above all the other Patriarchs, he ſuppoſes from a Letter of *Theodoſius* the Emperor, which he never ſaw, and which is not extant, That the Emperor writ to *Rome* about the Succeſſion of *Anatolius* at *Conſtantinople*, *knowing it to be the Head of all Churches* (q). This is a groundleſs Conjecture, becauſe he doth not ſo much as know in what

(n) *Baron.* An. 448. pag. 54.

(o) *Baron.* An. 449. pag. 86.

(p) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 88.

(q) *Baron.* An. 450. pag. 115.

ſtyle *Theodoſius* writ; and it was an Ancient Cuſtom, for to give Notice to all the abſent Patriarchs, when any New one was elected, and the Patriarch Elect (even he of *Rome*) was obliged to ſatisfie the reſt by Letters, that he held the Orthodox Faith. Certain it is that *Theodoſius* valued not *Leo* much; becauſe he confirmed the Condemnation of *Flavianus*, though he knew that Pope and his Legates were of his ſide; and it is plain by the beſt Hiſtorians that he died in this Opinion: Nor can *Baronius* prove, that *Theodoſius* repented of that miſtaken Judgment otherwiſe, than by *Nicephorus* (an Author of no credit when ſingle,) or that he *Obeyed the Pope before his death* (r); for this laſt he can cite no Author at all, and it is not only a Conjecture of his own, but a very falſe one. For the laſt Letter that ever *Theodoſius* writ to *Valentinian*, not many Months before his death (s), ſhews how little he eſteemed *Leo*'s Requeſt for a new General Council, and how cloſe he ſtuck to *Dioſcorus*, *Leo*'s Enemy; and therefore he could not write after this to *Leo, as Head of the Church*. His Succeſſor indeed, *Marcianus*, had ſome reaſon to Careſs the Pope, and therefore he writes more reſpectfully to him than other Emperors had uſed to do (t): Yet even in that firſt Letter of his he muſt be very ſagacious, who can diſcern what *Baronius* again ſuppoſes, *That* Marcian *turned his Eyes to the Chief viſible Head of the Church, reſolving to do all things by his command, or* (as he phraſes it) *to be at his beck:* For even in this higheſt ſtrain of Complement *Marcian* ſaith no more, but that *ſince* Leo *had a principal Biſhoprick among the true Believers, he deſires him to pray for him, that he might reſolve to call a Council with* Leo's *conſent, to take away all Error and ſettle a general Peace* (u). Which implies the power of calling Councils was in the Emperor, and the Popes part was only to conſent as one of the Chief Biſhops, who was there to meet and conſult: And if *Marcian* had known or believed *Leo* to be the ſole Supream Judge of all Controverſies, he would not have been at the trou-

(r) *Baron.* An. 450. pag. 117.

(s) *Baron.* An. 449 pag. 111.

(t) *Richer.* hiſt. Concil. gen. Tom. I. cap. 8. pag. 363.

(u) *Baron.* An. 450. pag. 118.

ble

ble of Calling a General Council, but referred all to him.

§. 4. The reſt of my Obſervations on *Baronius* ſhall be put in Order of Time for the better aſſiſtance of the Reader, and not under thoſe ſeveral Heads which doth too much ſeparate and confound things.

When S. *Hierom*, after three years labouring with Pope *Anaſtaſius*, had at laſt got him and the Roman Church to condemn *Ruffinus*, he then at that time prudently appeals to the Roman Churches Faith for Trial, Whether he or *Ruffinus* were the better Catholick: But *Baronius*, when he hath cited ſome words of S. *Hierom* againſt *Ruffinus* to this purpoſe, groſly prevaricates when he infers; *You ſee it was an undoubted Maxim, cuſtomary in the Mouths of all the Ancients, and a neceſſary conſequence, That if one were ſaid to follow the Roman Faith, he muſt needs be a Catholick* (w). For if we hear one Father when he had the Pope on his ſide in a particular Controverſie ſay this, This is not *all the Ancients*: And many of them deſcribe themſelves, as being of the Faith of *Athanaſius*, *Cyril*, *Flavianus*, *&c.* or holding the Faith of the Churches of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Conſtantinople*, *&c.* to prove themſelves Catholick; and if S. *Hierom* did inſtance now in *Rome*, the conſequence depended on the Orthodoxneſs of the preſent Pope, not on the Infallibility of his See. And Pope *Gelaſius* afterward confeſſeth, That the Roman Church in this Point was guided intirely by S. *Hierom*, *She thought as he thought* (x). So that to make a General concluſion from ſuch a ſpecial Caſe, is very unreaſonable; and S. *Hierom* himſelf a little after is cited, declaring the *Conſent of many Churches is of greater Authority, than that of the Roman alone* (y). It had been well if their Roman Church had conſidered *the peril of Idolatry*, when they went about to eſtabliſh the uſe of *Images*, as *Baronius* tells us *Theodoſius* did, when he made a Law to prohibit *any Adoration to be given to his own Statues, becauſe ſuch worſhip as exceeds the dignity of Human*

(w) *Baron.* An. 402. pag. 156.

(x) *Baron.* An. 402 pag. 159.

(y) Id. ibid. pag. 160.

man Nature, is to be reſerved to the Divine Majeſty. In the ſame place he relates how S. *Chryſoſtom* reproved the People for their folly at the dedication of the Empreſſes Statue; becauſe *it is eaſie in thoſe matters to run into the ſin of Idolatry* (z). Which Obſervations of his own ſtand on Record in theſe Annals, to condemn that Church which orders Veneration, and all other expreſſions of Reverence to be made to all ſorts of Images of the Saints. Again, he expoſes his dear Church in obſerving, *That the Ancients preſerved both the conſecrated Elements of the Sacrament in the Church.* But no ſooner had he condemned us for not following this ancient Uſage, but he mentions as great an Innovation in their own Church, for he owns they have forbid the preſerving any thing but the ſpecies of Bread (a). Now I would ask, Who differ moſt from Antiquity, they who totally take away one part of the Sacrament from the People, and keep only the Bread to be worſhipped: Or we who give both Bread and Wine to the People as they did, and provide both, newly Conſecrated, for the Sick, when there is occaſion, but reſerve neither for Worſhip? Which was the uſage of the firſt and pureſt times. And why may not we forbid the needleſs reſerving of the Sacrament in either kind, as well as they may prohibit it in one kind? But ſo inſatiable is his deſire to extol the Roman Church, that though he cite all he can find of this ſort good and bad, *he wiſhes* (in one place) *he could find ſome things, which are not to be found, that he might let his ſtyle run out on ſo luſcious a Subject* (b). We note alſo, that how much ſoever the Romaniſts here in the Reign of King *James* the Second were for Toleration, becauſe it was their Intereſt, *Baronius* highly commends the ſevere Penal Laws made by *Arcadius* and *Honorius* againſt ſuch as differed from the eſtabliſhed way of Worſhip and profeſſion of Faith (c); for *Baronius* is always a bitter Enemy to Toleration, and ſtiffly oppoſes the taking away any Penal Laws. Moreover it is obſervable, that though his Office be to write an Hiſtory and relate Matter

(z) *Baron. An.* 404. pag 187.

(a) *Baron. An.* 404. pag. 194.

(b) Id. ibid. pag. 206.

(c) *Baron. An.* 405. pag. 231. Vid. item An. 423. pag. 480.

Matter of Fact: When he comes to S. *Hierom*'s Book againſt *Vigilantius*, he puts on the Character of a Diſputant, and makes large digreſſions to the Hereticks, (as he calls the Reformed) to juſtifie ſuch a Veneration of Relicks, and ſuch a kind of worſhip of Saints, as *Rome* uſes at this day; which kind of Veneration and Worſhip S. *Hierom* would have condemned as well as *Vigilantius*(d), had it been practiſed in that Age. He notes that upon the difference between *Theophilus* and the Pope about S. *Chryſoſtom*, a Council of *Carthage writ to* Innocent, *That the Churches of* Rome *and* Alexandria *ſhould keep that Peace mutually which the Lord enjoyned* (e). Which ſhews, thoſe *African* Fathers did not think one of theſe Churches ſuperior in Authority to the other; for if ſo, they had no need to write to *Innocent*, but only to *Theophilus*, to ſubmit to the Supream Biſhop: For that was the only way to ſettle a Peace, if *Innocent*'s Supremacy had been then allowed. And it is a vain and falſe Conjecture, that if *Theophilus* had writ any Paſchal Epiſtles after his difference with *Innocent*, no Catholick would have received them (f). For divers Eminent and Orthodox Biſhops writ to *Theophilus*, and received Letters from him after this; yea, *Syneſius* himſelf writes to him, *to determine a Queſtion by the Authority of his Apoſtolical Succeſſion* (g), and he lived and died with the repute of a Catholick, though (as I have ſhewed) he never did yield to Pope *Innocent* in the caſe of S. *Chryſoſtom*. Alike groundleſs is his Conjecture, That *Arcadius* laboured to wipe out the ſtains he had contracted in perſecuting S. *Chryſoſtom*, *by tranſlating the Relicks of the Prophet* Samuel, *and by going into a Martyrs Temple and there praying* (not to the Martyr, obſerve that, but) *to God* (h). For if we ſet aſide the two forged Epiſtles recorded by *Baronius*, *pag.* 259. there is no good Evidence that *Arcadius*, at the time when the aforeſaid Acts were done, was convinced he had done any fault in the affair of S. *Chryſoſtom*; wherefore he could have no deſign to purge himſelf from a Fault he did not own at that time.

(d) *Baron. An.* 406. pag. 247, 248, &c. ad pag. 251.

(e) *Baron. An.* 407. pag. 253.

(f) *Baron.* ibid.

(g) Id. pag. 262.

(h) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 261.

In

In the next year he ſpoils one Argument to prove theirs the true Church, *viz.* by *Miracles*, ſince he owns *Atticus*, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, did work a Miracle even before he held Communion with the Roman Church (*i*). So that if Miracles prove a true Church, then a Church that ſeparates from the Roman Communion may be a true Church. Of which alſo we have another Inſtance ſoon after, where the Church of *Antioch* was in a difference with *Rome* for many years, (*Theodoret* ſaith, 85 years,) yet all that while ſhe was owned by the beſt Catholicks for a true Church (*k*). Nor do I ſee how that can be true which *Baronius* affirms, That *the cauſe of reſtoring the Eaſtern Biſhops to Communion in* Chryſoſtom's *caſe, was only decided by Pope Innocent*, ſince *Alexander* of *Antioch* did tranſact this affair in the Eaſt, and 24 Weſtern Biſhops ſubſcribed with *Innocent* in the Weſt, to teſtifie their conſent to this Agreement of *Alexanders* (l); yea, *Theodoret* aſcribes this, not to the Pope alone, but to all the Biſhops of the Weſt (*m*). But the *Annaliſt* will have all things done by the Pope alone, right or wrong. Poor *Socrates* is branded for a *Novatian* Heretick, becauſe he ſaith, *It was not the uſage of the Catholick Church to perſecute* (n). Yet the Emperor *Marcian* (o), and Pope *Gregory* (p), who were both I hope very good Catholicks, ſay the ſame thing; and therefore we may diſcern *Baronius* his Spirit, in being ſo bitter againſt all who cenſure Perſecuting. In the ſame Year we may ſee, that the Biſhops under *Theophilus* Juriſdiction (for all his quarrel at that time with the Pope) did reſerve the greater Caſes to his deciſion (*q*); and yet were very good Catholicks all the while. When a Biſhop pleads for Mercy to ſuch as have principally offended the Church, thoſe Interceſſions with Pious Magiſtrates ought to have the force of Commands; But to make a general Inference from hence, *That Biſhops ought to command things agreeable to the Chriſtian Law to Magiſtrates* (r), is to ſtretch the Inſtance too far. But there is another obvious Note from S. *Auguſtine's*

(i) *Baron. An.* 408. pag. 272.

(k) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 273.

(l) *Baron* ibid. pag 274.

(m) Ibid p. 275.

(n) *Baron. An.* 410 pag. 307.

(o) Concil. *Chalced. Bin.* Tom 2. par. 1. pag. 361.

(p) *Greg.* Mag. ep. ad Epiſc. *Conſtantinop.*

(q) *Baron. An.* 410. pag. 312.

(r) *Baron. An.* 412. pag. 334 & 335.

ſtine's petitioning and urging *Marcellinus* to ſpare the Hereticks, and not execute the ſeverity of the Temporal Laws upon them, which *Baronius* would not obſerve, *viz.* That the Primitive Biſhops uſed their power and intereſt to get Hereticks ſpared by Secular Magiſtrates, whereas the Inquiſitors uſe their power now to oblige the Lay-Magiſtrates to kill and deſtroy them. Further it is obſervable, that he takes upon him to interpret Gods Judgments in favour of his own Party; and thus he expounds the *Goths* invading *France*, to be a puniſhment for the Hereſies there broke out (*s*), which *Salvian* more piouſly makes to be a Scourge for their Immoralities. But I note, that it was but two year before that *Alaricus* waſted *Italy*, and took *Rome* it ſelf; yet *Baronius* could not diſcern any Hereſies there, but his general Maxim is, *That God is wont to bring deſtruction on thoſe Countries where Hereſies ariſe.* Now one might obſerve *Leo*'s attempts to uſurp a Supremacy over all other Biſhops, and the many pious Frauds uſed and beginning now to be countenanced at *Rome*, about falſe Relicks and feigned Miracles, were as probable occaſions of the Divine Judgments in *Italy*, as thoſe he aſſigns in *France*. To proceed, I cannot apprehend how *Atticus* could have ſo little Wit in his Anger againſt *Rome*, as to call *Paulinus* and *Evagrius* (ſucceſſively Biſhops of *Antioch*) *Schiſmaticks*, meerly for Communicating with the Roman Church, and this in a Letter to ſo great a Patriarch as S. *Cyril* (*t*), if he had known it to be then generally acknowledged (as *Baronius* often pretends,) that *to be in Communion with* Rome *was a certain ſign of a Catholick*; *and to differ with it, a ſure note of a Schiſmatick.* But S. *Cyril*'s Reproving *Atticus* for reſtoring *Chryſoſtom*'s Name into the Dyptics (which was the known deſire of Pope *Innocent*) ſhews (*u*), how little the reſt of the Patriarchs valued the Judgment or the Authority of the Popes, when they ſuppoſed them to be miſtaken in the Caſe: For none could or durſt have ſo ſeverely Cenſured the Opinion of a Perſon taken to be a Supream and Infallible

(*s*) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 345.

(*t*) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 348.

(*u*) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 350.

lible Judge. Again, I wonder how *Baronius* could Record without ſome reflection S. *Auguſtin's ſpeaking of* Oroſius *his Journey from* Spain *into* Africa, *only out of Zeal to underſtand the Scriptures, and his ſending him to* Paleſtine *to S.* Hierom *on that Errand* (w). For according to the Cardinals Notion, he ſhould have been more zealous for Catholick Tradition, than for Scripture, and *Rome* was the only place both to learn that in perfection, and by that to interpret the Scriptures unerringly; and this was nearer to *Spain* than either *Hippo* or *Bethlehem.* But while he owns, that the Salvation of ſome, after they had been purged by the Infernal Fire, was one of the Errors of *Origen*, and counted an Error both by *Oroſius* and *Auguſtine* (x), it ſeems to look ill upon Purgatory, which their modern Church hath made a Catholick Truth; but the Primitive cenſured it as a falſe Doctrine. The Reader alſo may note, that when he is commending *Theodoſius* for his Piety, he magnifies him for faſting upon Wedneſdays and Fridays (y), (the days now appointed for Abſtinence by the Proteſtant Church of *England*): So that a man may be a pious Catholick and not keep the Faſting-days appointed by the Roman Church, *viz.* Fridays and Saturdays. Moreover he contradicts himſelf when he ſaith, *According to the ancient uſage of ſpeaking, by the Apoſtolical Seat, is always to be underſtood the Roman Church* (z): Whereas he hath often owned the other Patriarchs Sees had the Title of *Apoſtolical Thrones and Seats*; and a little after cites *Sidonius* calling *Lupus* Biſhop of *Troys*, a Biſhop of Biſhops, who had ſat a long time in *an Apoſtolical Seat* (a), he cites *Poſſidius* in the Life of S. *Auguſtine*, to prove *the* Pelagians *were firſt condemned at* Rome, *and then at* Carthage (*b*). But if the Reader conſult that Author, he will find that S. *Auguſtine* writ againſt them, and that they went near to draw in firſt *Innocent* and then *Zoſimus* to their party, *till the Councils of Holy* African *Biſhops had with much labour perſuaded firſt the one of theſe Popes, and then the other, that this was an abominable Hereſie and contrary to*

(w) *Baron. An.* 414. pag. 363.

(x) *Baron.* ibid. pag. 364.

(y) *Baron. An.* 415. pag. 381.

(z) *Baron. An.* 416. pag 388.

(a) *Baron. An.* 426. pag. 499.

(b) *Baron. An.* 418. pag. 414, 415.

to the Catholick Faith (c): All which the Cardinal leaves out, and from half the ſtory makes a falſe Marginal Note, *viz. That theſe Hereticks were firſt condemned at* Rome, *and then at* Carthage: Which is every way falſe; for if it be meant of *Innocent*'s time, it is certain that the *African* Councils under the Primate of *Carthage*; yea, that of *Milevis* had ſolemnly condemned *Pelagianiſm* before this Pope would openly condemn them, he being under ſuſpicion of favouring that Hereſie to the laſt year of his Life (*d*); and this Council of *Carthage* did condemn theſe Hereticks while *Zoſimus* did defend them; ſo that *Africk*, not *Rome*, firſt diſcovered and cenſured this Hereſie. He alſo falſly cites the Preface of S. *Auguſtine*'s Books to Pope *Boniface*, againſt the *Pelagians*, telling us he affirms, *That the Pope being moſt eminent in the higheſt top of the Paſtoral Watch-Tower, did watch over all*; and from hence infers, That though S. *Auguſtine* and others ſometimes call the Pope *Brother*, and *Colleague*, yet ſtill they own his ſupream Paſtoral Power (*e*). But all that S. *Auguſtine* there ſaith is this, *Communiſque ſit omnibus nobis qui fungimur Epiſcopatûs officio (quamvis ipſe in eo præemineas celſiore faſtigio) ſpecula paſtoralis: The Paſtoral watching is common to all of us who are Biſhops, though you have the advantage of a higher ſtation* (f). Which words only intimate the Dignity of the Roman See, as to Order; but plainly declare Biſhops to have equal Obligations to guard the Church. And whereas a little after, from S. *Auguſtine*'s modeſt Complement of *ſending theſe Books to* Boniface, *to examine and correct*, he would inſinuate ſomething of Supremacy in Judging: This is no more than the ſame Father uſed to do to all other Biſhops to whom he dedicated his Books; ſo he deſires *Claudius*, a private Biſhop to *read and judge of his Books againſt* Julian, *dedicated to him* (g). This therefore aſcribes no Infallibility to *Rome*; and if S. *Auguſtine* himſelf had not judged better of *Pelagianiſm* than any Pope of theſe times, it would not have been condemned there to this day. After all theſe Inſtances of ſincerity, we cannot wonder

(c) *Poſſid.* vit. D. *Aug.* cap. 17.

(d) Vid. *Innoc.* Epiſt. 26. *Bin.* not. pag. 625.

(e) *Baron. An.* 419. pag. 442.

(f) *Aug.* Tom. 7. contr. 2 Epiſt. *Pelag.* fol. 186.

(g) *Aug.* ibid. contr. *Jul.* præf. fol. 202.

that he falls upon the Reformed as Innovators, for refuſing to ſtand to a General Council, and ſo *worſe than the* Pelagians *who deſired one* (h). But this calumny will ſoon be diſpelled, if we call to mind *the breach of Faith uſed to ſuch as had truſted* Rome, *in the Council of* Conſtance; the Tricks uſed by the Popes before the Council of *Trent* for many years together, to avoid a General Council, when the Reformed earneſtly deſired one; and the great partiality of that packt Aſſembly at *Trent*, who met not to examine or amend Abuſes, but to eſtabliſh them, and had reſolved to condemn the Proteſtants before they heard them. It is ſomething odd, that *Baronius* ſhould quote *Gelaſius* his Cenſure of the Legends and Acts of Martyrs, *That ſome of them were writ by Ideots, and ſome by Hereticks; wherefore the* Roman *Church then uſed not to read them in publick* (i). For this condemns him for filling ſo many Pages of his *Annals* with this Fabulous ſtuff, and diſcovers an alteration in the Roman Church, which of old was wiſer and honeſter than to read thoſe feigned Legends, that in after Ages took up a great part of their publick Service. We may further obſerve, That *Leporius*, an Arch-heretick recants in *Africa*, and applies himſelf to the *Gallican* Biſhops only, without any notice taken of *Rome* or Pope *Boniface* (k); which confutes what the *Annaliſt* often affirms, That all great Hereticks were obliged to recant at *Rome*. He publiſheth a Reſcript of *Theodoſius*, and bids us obſerve, that it contains the principal Feaſts received by the Chriſtians: Now theſe are *Sundays*, *Chriſtmas* and *Epiphany*, *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt*, with the Memory of the Apoſtles Paſſions, which is a Proteſtant Catalogue; and there is not one Feaſt of our Bleſſed Lady, Holy Croſs, *Corpus Chriſti*, *&c.* which are now ſo famous at *Rome* in all this number aſſigned by *Theodoſius* (l); which ſhews they are Innovations, and the effects of modern Superſtition. He relates it as the Cuſtom of S. *Auguſtine* and other Biſhops, as well as of Pope *Celeſtine*, to ſalute Presbyters by the name of *Sons*, and Biſhops

(h) *Baron. An.* 419. pag. 442. E.

(i) *Baron. An.* 419. pag. 456.

(k) *Baron. An.* 420. pag. 465.

(l) *Baron. An.* 425. pag. 489.

Biſhops by the name of *Brothers* (m), which looks not favourably on the Pope's Univerſal Superiority above all Biſhops whatſoever. When Pope *Gregory* groſly miſtakes *Sozomen*'s Hiſtory for *Theodoret*'s, *Baronius* had better have owned it; for none ever thought Popes infallible in their Quotations; but the Cardinal reſolves right or wrong to vindicate *Gregory* (n), who rejects *Sozomen*'s Hiſtory for that paſſage which is in *Theodoret*, but is not in *Sozomen*; ſo raſhly do Popes judge ſometimes: The Paſſage is about commending *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* as an Orthodox Father to the time of his death, which *Theodoret* doth affirm; but *Sozomen* only mentions this *Theodorus* (o) his Converſion by S. *Chryſoſtom*, but ſaith no more of him; and *Baronius* is forced to feign this Paſſage was in that Part of *Sozomen* which was long ſince loſt, and which probably S. *Gregory* himſelf never ſaw; however *Baronius* knows nothing what was there written, and therefore it is very boldly done to ſuppoſe a thing for a certain Truth, which he could never know any thing of, only to ſave the Credit of a Pope who had little or no skill in Greek Authors. Again, 'tis apparently partial in him, where he produces ſome ancient Teſtimonies of the *French*, being wont *to break their words*, to reſtrain this in modern Times only to that part of them which is Reformed, while he boaſts of his Catholicks as the *juſteſt Men in the World* (p). To confute which, the Perjury and Treachery of the Leaguers in our Fathers time, and the many Promiſes and Engagements broken to the late *Hugonots* in our days, are abundantly ſufficient. He takes it for a proof, that the Eaſtern Biſhops uſe to refer Cauſes of the greateſt moment to the Pope, becauſe one *Daniel* a French Biſhop fled out of his own Country for his Crimes, (probably into the Eaſt) was complained of to the Pope, being Uncanonically Ordained; which Complaint the Pope tranſmits to the Biſhops of the Province of *Narbon*, as the proper Judges in that matter (q); ſo that this Cauſe was not referred to him at all, only he was deſired to acquaint thoſe

(m) *Baron. An.* 426. pag. 498.

(n) *Baron. An.* 427. pag. 507.

(o) *Sozom.* hiſt. lib. 8. cap. 2.

(p) *Baron. An.* 428. pag. 512.

(q) Id. ibid.

with it who ought to determine that Point. Moreover, he makes it a certain Evidence that *Socrates* was an Heretick, becauſe he complains of *Neſtorius*, for urging the Emperor to perſecute Hereticks (as ſoon as ever he was Ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*) (r). But this Kingdom hath found Romaniſts (when it was their Intereſt) to cenſure Men as Hereticks for the contrary, *viz.* for only inſiſting upon the execution of ſome gentle Penal Laws upon ſuch as differed from the eſtabliſhed Religion. He commends S. *Cyril* for his Modeſty, in not mentioning the Fault of *Theodoſius* his abetting *Neſtorius*; yet he upon bare Surmizes ſpeaks very opprobriouſly of *Theodoſius* upon this account, and reflects upon all Kings and Sovereigns as inclined to follow his Example (s). Now if the ſilence of theſe things proves *Cyril*'s Modeſty, who muſt needs know whether *Theodoſius* were guilty of this or no; Doth it not prove ſomebodies Immodeſty to rail by meer Conjectures at *Theodoſius* and all Princes? To proceed, It is a very falſe conſequence from *Cyril*'s calling in *Celeſtine* to his aſſiſtance againſt *Neſtorius*, and that Popes condemning the Heretick in his private Council at *Rome*, *That it was the Ancient cuſtom from the beginning, for S.*Peter's *Chair alone to determine controverſies of Faith, and condemn Hereſies with their Authors as they ariſe* (t). For *Cyril* had firſt condemned this Heretick and his Opinions, and the Pope only came in as his Second; yet after all it was neceſſary that a General Council ſhould condemn him, which had been needleſs if the Pope alone, or in conjunction with another Patriarch had been ſufficient. Again, he cites two Authors only for *Celeſtine*'s ſending a Pall and a Mitre to S. *Cyril*, and theſe Writers lived 8 or 900 year after this time, and he rejects ſome part of their account as fabulous; yet from this Evidence he would prove, *That* Cyril *was* Celeſtine's *Legate in the Council of* Epheſus (u): But he muſt have better proof than this to make us believe ſo incredible a thing. We may further note, that where *Poſſidius* is ſo particular in the circumſtances of S. *Au.*

(r) Id. *An.* 428. pag. 513.

(s) *Baron. An.* 429 pag. 527. Vide iterum *An.* 430. pag. 550.

(t) *Baron. An.* 430. pag. 533.

(u) Id. ibid. pag. 538.

S. *Auguſtine*'s death, he mentions nothing of any Image of the Bleſſed Virgin or the Saints; no Crucifix placed before him, but only the Penitential Pſalms were writ out and faſtned on the Wall, which he read over as he lay on his Death-bed. Nor doth he mention any Office ſaid for his Soul after he was dead, but only an Office for commending his Body to the Grave (*w*), which ſhews theſe were deviſed in later and more Superſtitious Times. *Baronius* indeed ſuppoſes the word *Sacrificium*, to ſignifie the Maſs here; but it ſeems to ſignifie no more than the uſual Office at putting the Body into the Grave, in hopes of a joyful Reſurrection. But though nothing be more evident, even in theſe *Annals*, to a Judicious Reader, than the many Innovations in Doctrin and Worſhip, made by the modern Roman Church, contrary to the Decrees of Councils, the Judgment and Practice of the Ancient Fathers; the *Annaliſt* a little after (upon *Capreolus* Biſhop of *Carthage* his affirming that to be the true Faith which is delivered by the Fathers) flies out into foul Language againſt the Reformed Churches for Innovations and reviving Hereſies condemned by the Fathers (*x*). Whereas we freely refer it to thoſe Ancients to judge between us, Whether they or we come nearer to the Doctrin and Uſages of pure Antiquity, and can from ſubſtantial Evidence prove them to be the Innovators. I will only note, That in this Epiſtle of *Capreolus*, this Biſhop calls the Emperor, *His Lord*, and *his Son* (*y*): Upon which *Baronius* makes no Remark, becauſe he would have it thought that no Biſhop, but only the Pope did ever call the Emperor, *Son*. For he alone is to be the Father of all Princes and all Biſhops alſo. A little after he interprets that woful deſtruction of the Emperor's Army in *Africa*, to be a Divine Judgment upon him for countenancing the Heretical party at *Epheſus* (z). Though not many Pages from hence he lays all the blame of this Connivance upon the Treachery of the Emperor's Domeſticks (*a*), and he may find as great Defeats hapning often

(*w*) *Poſſid. vit. Aug. verſ. fin.* & *Baron. An.* 430. pag. 554.

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 564.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 431. pag. 563.

(z) *Baron* ibid. pag. 591.

(*a*) Id. ibid. pag. 597.

often when the Emperors did take the Catholick part. So true is that of *Solomon*, *No man knoweth either love or hatred by all that is before him. All things come alike to all, &c.* Eccleſix.1,2. 'Tis remarkable what *Baronius* ſaith of a very dubious Reſcript of *Valentinian*, cited for the Authority of the See of *Ravenna* by the Friends of that Biſhoprick, *The love of our Country is an imperious thing; yea, a Tyrant, which compels an Hiſtorian to defend thoſe things, which if they were ſaid of another place, he would utterly explode* (b); which with the reſt there ſaid, is ſo applicable to the Cardinal (as to *Rome*), that the only wonder is, he did not ſee how ſevere a Cenſure he (as *David* once did upon *Nathan*'s Parable) here paſſeth upon himſelf. Again, he forgets that the Miracle out of *Proſper* concerning a Maid, who could not ſwallow a piece of the Sacramental Bread dipped in Wine (being poſſeſſed), but was cured by drinking of the Cup (c), manifeſtly ſhews the Innovation of the Roman Church, in that it declares they uſed then to dip the Bread in Wine, and thought it lawful to give the Cup to the Laity; whereas now they only give the people a dry Wafer. It was certainly a great overſight in the *Armenian* Biſhops (according to him who makes the Pope the ſole Judge of Hereſie) to ſend to *Proclus* of *Conſtantinople*, to know whether the Writings of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* were Orthodox or no? Yet *Liberatus* (an ancient Author) affirms they did this *ſecundum morem, according to Cuſtom* (d). So that neither *Liberatus* nor the *Armenians* knew of any Cuſtom to go only to *Rome*, out of the Eaſt, to enquire concerning the true Faith; had they known this, no doubt they would have ſent a little further. Moreover, he highly extols the Piety of *Florentius* the *Prætorian Præfect*, who finding the Tax paid by the Curtezans of *Conſtantinople* to the Exchequer, hindred their expulſion from that City, gave Lands of his own to compenſate the Publick damage, that he might get thoſe Infamous Women baniſhed (e); forgetting all the while the Impiety of the Pope and Cardinals, who now tolerate them for

(b) *Baron. An.* 432.p.631,&c.

(c) *Baron. An.* 434.pag.646, 647.

(d) *Baron. An.* 435.pag.649.

(e) *Baron. An.* 439.pag.677.

for a little ſcandalous Penſion paid to their Treaſury at *Rome*. He alſo ſaith, It is a *Pelagian* Principle and Hereſie, to hold, That *no Rich man can be ſaved, unleſs he give all his Eſtate to the Poor* (f). Yet he knew many hundred Monaſteries which have been and are endowed with great Eſtates, upon a Principle nothing different from this, which is preached frequently to rich Men and Women dying in their Churches Communion, by cunning and covetous Prieſts and Jeſuits. It is manifeſt partiality alſo in him, to affirm it was a Judgment of God to deliver *Carthage* to the *Vandals*, becauſe there was Pagan Idolatry practiſed in that City (g). But the ſame kind of Idolatry was continued in *Rome* notwithſtanding all endeavours to root it out, till the *Goths* took it; but the *Annaliſt* doth not expound that Calamity after the ſame manner (h). Thus he exclaims againſt the Cruelty of *Genſericus* the *Vandal* for perſecuting the Orthodox Biſhops upon the bare naming of *Pharaoh*, *Nebuchadnezzar* or *Holofernes* in their Sermons, pretending it was meant of him (i). Whereas had he lived to this Age, he might have ſeen a King intituled, *The moſt Chriſtian*, inſtigated by the Jeſuits to perſecute the Reformed Paſtors for the ſame pretended Fault. It is remarkable that *Theodoret*, when he writes to a Biſhop of *Alexandria* proves himſelf Orthodox, becauſe his Faith was the ſame with the former Biſhops of that See, *viz. Alexander*, *Athanaſius*, *Achillas*, *Theophilus* and *Cyril*; as alſo with S. *Baſil* and *Gregory*, the Lights of the World (k). The Pope is not named, ſo that doubtleſs he was not the ſole Standard of Catholick Communion then; if he had, the name of one Pope had been more to *Theodoret*'s purpoſe than all theſe. Again, That Pope *Leo* writes as imperiouſly to *Dioſcorus* of *Alexandria*, as he uſe to do to others, is very true, but it no where appears that *Dioſcorus* obſerved his Orders: Much leſs will it follow from hence, *That* Leo *was the Maſter ſet over all Churches* (l); ſuch aſſuming of Empire over our Equals, may indeed ſhew our Ambition, but it will not prove our Right. It is obvious

(f) Id. *An.* 440. pag. 682.

(g) *Baron.* Tom. VI. An. 440. pag. 5.

(h) Vid. *Baron.* An. 410.

(i) *Baron. An.* 442. pag. 12.

(k) *Baron. An.* 444. pag. 23.

(l) *Baron. An.* 444. pag. 25.

obvious to all that read *Baronius*, how he ſtrains all things that are ſaid of S. *Peter*, to apply them to the Roman Church; but the Reader may note how ſilently he paſſes it by, when our *Gildas* calls the Britiſh Biſhops Sees here in this Iſland, *the Seats of* Peter (*m*). But this may ſatisfie all impartial Men, that the Ancients accounted other Biſhops *the Succeſſors of S.* Peter, as well as the Pope, though now he alone uſurps that and many other Priviledges, of Old enjoyed in common by others, as well as by the Biſhop of *Rome*. Again, he ſpoils the Old famous Story of the Converſion of *Spain* by S. *James*, wherein the *Spaniards* ſo much pride themſelves, out of a zealous partiality for *Rome*, which inclines him to affirm, *That* Spain *firſt received the Goſpel from the Roman Church* (n): Which Notion may in time leſſen the Pilgrimaes to S. *James* of *Compoſtella*, and calls in queſtion the Devotion of thoſe many Thouſands, who have believed his Body to be there, and worſhip his Relicks in that place with great aſſurance. Soon after, upon occaſion of *Turibius*, complaining of the Apocryphal Books uſed by the *Priſcillian* Hereticks in *Spain*, the Cardinal ſhews the neceſſity of ſuppreſſing all Books that are againſt the Catholick Doctrin, and urges the Biſhop of *Spain* to ſuppreſs a Book writ by one *John de Roa*, about the Rights of Princes, containing Doctrins (as he ſaith) which he could not learn from the Jeſuits, Fryers or Clergy of *Spain* (o). Now how many Books (as Apocryphal as thoſe of the old Hereticks, and as extravagant for the Rights of the Pope, as any that ever were writ on any Subject in the World) doth *Baronius* cite, approve and admire? But one Book that ſpeaks for the Prince, and the Civil Rights of Men, muſt by no means be endured. 'Tis obſervable alſo, That when *Theodoret* was ſuſpected of Hereſie, he appeals to a Council in which the Biſhops and Magiſtrates may meet, and the Judges may determin what is conſonant to the Apoſtolical Doctrin (*p*). Now if it had been known and believed then, that the Popes Communion was enough to make a man a Catho-

(m) *Baron. An.* 446. pag. 36.

(n) *Baron. An.* 447. pag. 42.

(o) Id. ibid. pag. 44.

(p) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 53.

Catholick, and he had been the ſole Judge, why did not *Theodoret* in one word appeal to the Pope, and ſay he was in Communion with *Leo* Biſhop of *Rome*? He approves *Theodoret*'s Cenſure of *Dioſcorus*, for invading the Rights of other Dioceſes, contrary to the Canons of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople*, and he blames *Dioſcorus* for his Pride and Ambition; but though the Pope labour to invade all Dioceſes, and make all the Biſhops in the World his Vaſſals, contrary to Law, Equity, and Primitive Uſage, this is no Crime in a Friend (*q*). *Baronius* is miſerably put to it about the Epiſtle of *Ibas*, judged (by two Councils) to be Heretical; yet approved by the Infallible Chair. This makes him contradict himſelf ſtrangly; for here he ſaith, *This was really* Ibas *his Epiſtle, as the Tenth Action at* Chalcedon *teaches, and himſelf confeſſed; and the Opinion of the Apoſtolick Legates of* Maximus *of* Antioch *and others confirm it, and* Ibas *was proved a Catholick by it* (r). But *Baronius* had before cited the Tenth Action at *Chalcedon* to prove, *That this Epiſtle in that Council was found not to be* Ibas *Epiſtle, and ſo the Epiſtle was condemned, and he abſolved* (s). And in the former place, as well as elſewhere (*t*), he affirms the Epiſtle contained Blaſphemy and Hereſie; yet Pope *Vigilius* approved it; and the Cardinal ſaith, *Ibas* was by this Epiſtle found to be a Catholick. He that can make theſe Contradictions friends, or reconcile them to the Infallibility, ——*erit mihi magnus Apollo.* He commends Pope *Leo* for reproving *Theodoſius* the Emperor gently and mildly, when he was going to eſtabliſh Hereſie by a Pſeudo-Synod (*). Whereas Old *Eli*'s Example may ſhew (if the Emperor was his Inferior in this matter, and the Pope his Ghoſtly Father) that his Reproof ought to have been ſharper; yea, he ſhould have expreſly prohibited the convening of this Council (if his Authority was neceſſary to their Meeting) and have not ſo meanly truckled as to ſend his Legates to a Synod, which he judged needleſs, yea, dangerous (*u*). And if we conſider *Leo*'s high Spirit,

(*q*) Id. ibid. pag 54.

(r) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 67.

(*s*) Id. *An.* 432. pag. 626.

(*t*) Id. Tom. 7. *An.* 553. Vid. *Crakenthorp. Vigil. dormitans*, cap. 10. p. 110.

(*) *In cujus manu eſt ut prohibeat, jubeo agi, ſi non prohibet admitti.* Salvian.

(u) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 80.

this Submiſſion ſhews, he had no right to call a General Council, nor power to hinder the Emperor from appointing one. Again, When the Pope (by *Proſper*'s help) had writ a very ſeaſonable and Orthodox Epiſtle againſt *Eutyches*, the French Biſhops were careful to have it exactly Tranſcribed; but it follows not from hence, *That they would not vary one ſyllable from his Decrees* (w). For this reſpect was ſhewed, not to the Authority of the See, but to the excellency of the Epiſtle, as appears in that the Gallican Biſhops (as hath been ſhewed) rejected other Decrees both of this Pope and his Predeceſſors, when they diſliked them. And *Baronius* owns a little after, that theſe Biſhops *rejoyced that this Epiſtle contained their own ſenſe as to the Faith, and were glad that the Pope held the ſame Opinion, that they had always held from the Tradition of their Anceſtors* (x). So that this is no Proof, as he would have it, *That the Pope was a Maſter preſiding over all the Chriſtian World.* For they judged of his Teaching, and approved it, becauſe it agreed with their Churches ancient Tradition. On no better grounds he gathers, *there was One only lawful Judge, One Governor of Holy things always in the Church*, viz. *the Pope*; From *Theodoret*'s Epiſtle to *Leo* (y): For firſt, theſe Epiſtles are juſtly ſuſpected, as being not heard of till they came to light firſt out of the *Vatican*: And, ſecondly, they are demonſtrated to be ſpurious by divers Learned Men, and eſpecially this to *Leo*, is ſhewed to contain manifeſt Contradictions (z). Thirdly, If this Epiſtle were genuine, it muſt be conſidered that all the Patriarchs, except the *Roman*, were at that time either corrupted or oppreſſed, and in that juncture *Theodoret* could appeal to none of them but *Leo*, and ſo might well give him good words, who alone was likely and able to aſſiſt him. As for that Teſtimony wherein they much glory, *That* Rome *had the Supremacy over all Churches*, (as their Tranſlation ſpeaks) *becauſe it was always free from Hereſie, and no Heretick had ſat there* (a), it ſuppoſes a long experience of the Church of *Romes* Integrity

(w) Id. ibid. pag. 82.

(x) Id. ibid. pag. 86.

(y) *Baron. An.* 449. pag. 99, 101.

(z) *Rivet.* Crit. ſacr. lib. 4. c. 21. Vid *Crakenth.* Vigil. dorm. pag. 444.

(a) Id. *Baron.* ib. p. 102.

Integrity before this Priviledge was beſtowed; and if the Supremacy was given her for this Reaſon, ſhe ought to loſe it again whenever any Heretical Pope ſhall get the Chair; nor doth *Theodoret* at all ſuppoſe this impoſſible for the future. Moreover he brags, that *Leo* reſtored *Theodoret* and others, depoſed by this Pſeudo-*Epheſine*-Synod, and infers, *That it was the Popes priviledge alone to reſtore Biſhops depoſed by a Council* (b). But the Misfortune is, *Theodoret* was called an Heretick after the Pope had privately acquitted him, and his Cauſe was to be tried over again at *Chalcedon*; and till that Council reſtored him he remained ſuſpended for all this pretended Priviledge of the Pope. And before we leave him we may note, that he uſed all his Intereſt to perſuade the Emperor to call a lawful and impartial General Council, as appears by all his Epiſtles to his ſeveral Friends (c); which ſhews he knew it was in the Emperor's power alone to call one; not in the Pope's, to whom he would have written, (being in favour with him) if he had had Authority in this Affair. He reckons *Attila*'s leaving to harraſs the Eaſtern Empire, to be a Divine Reward for *Marcian*'s ſetling the true Religion there; but preſently tells us, That this Scourge of God, and other ſad Judgments fell upon *Italy* and the Weſtern Empire; from whence he ſuppoſes the Reformation of all Eaſtern Hereſies came, and where he believes no Hereſie could ever take place (d). So miſerably do Men expoſe themſelves, when they pretend to give Reaſons for all God's Diſpenſations. In the next year hapned the Famous Council of *Chalcedon*, wherein divers of *Baronius*'s Frauds have been already detected; ſo that I am only to add, That *Leo* was politick in pretending to give *Anatolius* a power to receive Recanting Biſhops, who had fallen into *Eutyches* Hereſie, and cunningly reſerves the greater Caſes to his own See (e). But 'tis plain, *Anatolius* of *Conſtantinople* had as much power in the Provinces ſubject to him, as the Pope had in *Italy*, and the greater Caſes were, according to ancient Uſage,

(b) Id. ibid. pag. 103.

(c) *Baron. An.* 450. pag. 122, 123, 124.

(d) *Baron. An.* 450. pag. 125.

(e) *Baron. An.* 451. p. 128, & 130.

reſerved to the next General Council, where both the Biſhop of *Rome* and *Conſtantinoples* Acts were to be re-examined, and none of theſe Erring Biſhops were reſtored but by that Council. And finally, he makes it a great Crime in *Dioſcorus* to pretend to Lord it over *Egypt*, and to ſay, He had as much Authority there as the Emperor (*f*). Yet the following Popes did and ſaid as much in relation to *Italy*; but *Baronius* cannot ſee any harm in that, though *Socrates* did, who ſaith, *That both the Biſhops of* Rome *and* Alexandria *had exceeded the bounds of Prieſtly-power, and fallen to a ſecular way of Ruling* (g). And this may ſuffice for this Part of the Period we have undertaken.

(*f*) Id. ibid. pag. 144.

(g) *Socrat.* lib. 7. cap. 11.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Roman Errors and Forgeries in the Councils, from the end of the Fourth Council, till An. Dom. 500.

§. 1. THE Synod of *Alexandria* is falſly ſtyled in the Title, *under* Leo: For their own Text confeſſeth, *it was aſſembled by the Authority of* Proterius *Biſhop of* Alexandria (*a*). *An. Dom.* 453.

(a) *Bin.* Tom. 2. part. 1. p. 419. *Lab.* Tom. 4. Col. 1007.

The Second Council of *Arles*, which *Binius* had antedated 70 year, and put out with this falſe Title, *under Siricius*, is by *Labbè* (b) placed here according to *Sirmondus* his direction.

(b) *Lab.* col. 1010.

The Council of *Anjou*, in *Binius*, is ſaid to be held *under* Leo; who is not once named in it: Wherefore *Labbè* leaves out that falſe Inſcription, and only ſaith, it was held in the 13*th* year of Pope *Leo* (c).

(c) *Bin.* p. 420. *Lab.* col. 1020.

The 4*th* Canon of this Council is corrupted by *Binius* and *Baronius*. For where the Text reads, *If any be* [cœlibes] *unmarried*, they put into the Margen as a better reading, *if any be* [debiles] *weak*: Which is to make the Reader believe, that all the Clergy then were unmarried; whereas this Canon ſuppoſes many of them had Wives. And the 11*th* Canon allows a married Man to be choſen Prieſt or Deacon, (the Popes Decrees not yet prevailing in *France*:) So that *Labbè* honeſtly ſtrikes out [*debiles*] and keeps only the true reading (*d*). We note alſo, that in the end of this 4*th* Canon, *ſuch Clerks as meddle in ſurrendring Cities are excommunicated*. A Sentence which if it were now executed, would put many Prieſts and Jeſuits out of the Communion of the Church, for their treachery to the Emperor and the King of *Spain*, many of whoſe Cities they have betrayed to the French.

(d) *Bin.* ut ſupr. *Lab.* col. 1021, &c.

The

The Notes falſly cite the firſt Canon, and ſo doth *Baronius* (e) ſaying, it orders, *That the Clergy ſhall not againſt their Biſhops Sentence ſeek to ſecular Tribunals*; and pretending this was in oppoſition to an Edict of *Valentinian*, publiſhed the year before, which reſtrained the Biſhops Juriſdiction to matters of Religion, unleſs the parties choſe them. Now the true words of the Canon are, *The Clergy ſhall not appeal from the Biſhops Sentence, nor ſeek to Secular Tribunals, without conſulting the Biſhop.* And *Valentinian*'s Law was of no force in *France*, nor probably had theſe Biſhops ever heard there was ſuch a Law; ſo that it is not likely they ever thought of oppoſing it. Finally, We obſerve that *Baronius* without any Authority falſly affirms, that *this Council was ſent to* Rome *(f) only to inſinuate, that it was to be confirmed there.* Whereas till *Fronto-Ducæus* found the Manuſcript in *France*, they at *Rome* ſeem to have known nothing of it.

(e) *Bin.* pag. 420. *Lab.* Col. 1022. *Bar. An.* 453. n.

(f) *Baron. An.* 453. n.

The Council of *Vannes* placed by *Binius* here, by *Sirmondus* Authority is removed to *An.* 465. in *Labbè* (g). Nothing in it is remarkable, but that the Aſſembly deſires (not the Pope, but) the abſent Biſhops of their own Province to confirm the Canons thereof.

(g) *Bin.* pag. 421. *Lab.* Col. 1054.

An. Dom. 459. The Council of 73 Biſhops at *Conſtantinople*, was called by, and held under *Gennadius* Patriarch of that City, and ſo is falſly titled *under* Leo; whoſe Legates do not ſubſcribe it, and ſo probably were not preſent at it (*h*). *Baronius* indeed ſaith they were, but proves it only by conjecture, becauſe *Leo* in an Epiſtle ſpeaks of his Legates, being come back to *Rome* the year after (*i*). But the wonder is, how *Baronius* and *Binius* (who confeſs all the Acts are loſt, except one Canon about Simony) came to know, that *Eutyches* was condemned, and the Council of *Chalcedon* confirmed in this Council. However, if it was confirmed, no doubt the Greek Biſhops would confirm the Canons of it; with the reſt, to which the Popes Legates could not conſent: But ſince we hear of no difference, it is like theſe Legates were not preſent.

(h) *Bin.* pag. 425. *Lab.* Col. 1025.

(i) *Baron.* An. 459. n.

§. 2. Pope

§. 2. Pope *Hilary* (who ſucceeded *Leo*) might juſtly be ſuſpected of Hereſie, becauſe he confirms no more than three General Councils, omitting that of *Conſtantinople* which condemned *Macedonius*. But ſince there is no evidence of this Univerſal Epiſtle confirming the other three Councils, but only the fabulous Pontifical, we may acquit him, and perhaps even in the very Pontifical, this Council may have been eraſed after the controverſie of the Primacy was ſtarted (*l*). However, this being owned all along by the Catholick Church for a General Council, it can ſuffer nothing by the Popes not confirming it; he alone would deſerve cenſure for not ſubſcribing to it. *An. Dom.* 461.

(*l*) Vita *Hilar. Bin.* pag. 424. *Lab.* Col. 1029.

The Spaniſh Biſhops who write to this Pope, by their Countries being waſted by *Euaricus* the Goth (*m*) were deſtitute of Power, and deſire *Hilary* to declare the Canons in ſome particular Caſes, hoping the perſons concerned (who deſpiſed them in their low eſtate,) might have more reſpect for a great Patriarch (*n*). So that it is very Sophiſtical in the Annaliſt and *Binius*, to draw conſequences from hence, for the Popes being the Supream Judge, and having power to diſpenſe with all Canons. The Pope himſelf in his Anſwer pretends no ſuch thing (*o*). He only declares the Canons, but diſpenſes with none: Yet if he had ſuch a power, doubtleſs he ought to have uſed it in *Irenæus* his Caſe.

(m) *Baron. An.* 464. n.

(n) *Bin.* pag. 425, & 426. *Lab.* Col. 1034, & 1035.

(o) *Hilar.* ep 2. *Bin.* pag. 426. *Lab.* Col. 1035.

But the third Epiſtle of *Hilary*, writ about the ſame affair, ſeems to diſcover, that all theſe Epiſtles (which talk ſo big of the Popes Supremacy) are counterfeit: For the Forger, weary of inventing new Phraſes, ſteals the beginning *verbatim* out of thoſe Epiſtles, that are falſly aſcribed to *Zepherine* and *Fabian*, and were not extant until long after Pope *Hilary*'s death (*p*). And *Labbe*'s Marginal Note on *Binius* Annotations ſhews, he ſmelt out the Cheat, if he durſt have ſpoken freely.

(p) *Hilar* ep 3. *Bin.* pag. 427. *Lab.* Col. 1038.

The

The Notes on the 4*th* Epiſtle own, that the Popes may be cajoled by falſe Stories, and deceived in Matter of Fact; and this ſo far as to condemn holier Biſhops than themſelves, as *Leo* and this *Hilary* did, in the caſes of *Hilary* of *Arles*, and *Mammertus* of *Vienne* (q). And it is not eaſie to underſtand, how he who miſtakes Matter of Fact, can infallibly apply the Law to a Fact wherein he is miſtaken.

(q) *Hilar.* Ep. 4. *Bin.* pag. 427. *Lab.* col. 1039.

The 5*th* Epiſtle was writ three year before thoſe that precede it, and the Humility of the Style makes me think it the only genuine Letter (as yet ſet down) of this Pope; for he writes to the Biſhop of *Arles* (not as a Son, but) as a Brother, and takes it well that he adviſed him to keep cloſe to the Ancient Canons.

The 9*th* Epiſtle ſhews, that *Mammertus* his Piety was no protection to him, againſt the injuries of the Roman Court (r). But *Binius* doth penance for this in his Notes on the 11*th* Epiſtle (s); though all his devices will neither excuſe his Popes Morals in perſecuting ſo great a Saint, nor vindicate his Judgment who was ſo groſly miſtaken.

(r) *Hilar.* Ep. 9. *Bin.* pag. 429. *Lab.* col. 1043.
(s) Not. in Ep. 11. *Bin.* p. 431. *Lab.* col. 1047.

There is but one Roman Council under this Pope, called (as is pretended) to confirm his falſe Judgment about the Spaniſh Biſhops; for they abſolve the guilty *Sylvanus*, and condemn *Irenæus* who was innocent: And though this Popes being commonly in the wrong makes it probable, he might get ſuch a Council together, yet the very Acts ſmell ſtrong of Forgery, as well as the former Epiſtles in theſe caſes (t): For beſides their Stile, *Maximus* Biſhop of *Turin* is mentioned not only as preſent at it, but ſpeaking in it, who died (as *Gennadius* (u) a Writer of that Age and Country affirms,) in the Reign of *Honorius* and the younger *Theodoſius*, that is, above 40 year before this Council: So that *Baronius* is very bold out of a ſuſpected Council, to correct a Writer who lived ſo near this time, againſt the Authority of divers printed Copies (w). And *Binius* is more audacious to cover this with an evident falſification of *Gennadius*, as if he ſaid, *Maximus*

(t) Concil. Rom. *Bin.* pag. 431. *Lab.* col. 1061.
(u) *Gennad.* Catal. ap. *Hieron.* Tom. 1. pag. 466. & opera *Maxim. Turin.* pag. 1.
(w) *Baron. An.* 465. n.

mus lived under thoſe Emperors, but continued Biſhop till this time (*x*). And now let *Baronius* boaſt of the Acclamations of this Synod, (common in other Councils) as a ſingular honour done to *Hilary*; for after all it is plain, he liked not the Canons of it ſo well as to give them a place in his Annals (*y*), which here he fills up with other manifeſt impertinencies.

(*x*) Not. *Bin.* ut ſupra.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 465. n.

§. 3. The next Pope was *Simplicius*, whoſe appointing Weekly Confeſſors at *Rome*, is far from proving (what the Notes infer) that their Sacramental Confeſſion was inſtituted by Chriſt (*z*). Nor is it for the credit of this Pope that *three parts of ſeven in* Rome *it ſelf were Arrians in his time* (a). But the Pontifical gives the reaſon of it, and expreſly charges him with diſſimulation (*b*). Which ſeems a juſt cenſure; for though the Arrians and Photinians ſadly infeſted the Weſtern Church (*c*): And though the Princes of that time were generally heretical (*d*); yet poor *Simplicius* did nothing, and till he had been eight years Pope, *Baronius* cannot pick up one Memoir concerning him, except a few Brags of an intereſted Succeſſor of his, concerning his reſiſting the Eaſtern Emperors, which are both falſe and incredible: Yea, the Annals ſhew that all the great Affairs of this time were managed by S. *Epiphanius* Biſhop of *Pavy*, who far outſhined *Simplicius* (e). Wherefore I wonder that *Du Pin* ſhould ſay, *He was very full of buſineſs all the time of his Popedom* (f); ſince for more than half that time there is no true account of his doing any thing: And when he did begin to write, *Baronius* owns, *He did no good by any of his Letters* (g); yet a little before, having a bad Memory, he had ridiculouſly boaſted, *That* Simplicius *in the midſt of the Arrian fury governed the See, with the ſame Authority and freedom that his Predeceſſors had done, bearing the Cauſes of all the World, depriving and reſtoring Biſhops, correcting Emperors, oppoſing barbarous Kings, and ſitting as Arbiter and Judge in all things over the Eaſt and Weſt, as* (he ſaith) *he hath proved in the ſeveral years of his Pon-*

An. Dom. 467.

(*z*) Not. in vit. *Simp. Bin.* pag. 434. *Lab.* col. 1067.

(*a*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 435. *Lab.* col. 1068.

(*b*) Vit. *Simplic. Bin.* pag. 434. *Lab.* col. 1066.

(c) *Baron. An.* 475. n.

(*d*) Id. An. 476. n. 6. p. 318.

(e) *Baron. An.* 471. n &c.

(f) *Du Pin.* Eccleſ. Hiſt. Vol. 4. p. 159.

(g) *Baron. An.* 483. n. 19. pag. 374.

tifical (h). Let the Reader ſearch, and try if he can find this proved. On the contrary this Pope flattered all Parties, and truckled to the Heretical Uſurper *Baſilius* (as I ſhall ſhew preſently) nor durſt he attempt to do Juſtice to a perſecuted Orthodox Biſhop of *Alexandria*, becauſe (as an old faithful Hiſtorian tells us (*i*),) *Zeno* the Emperor had forbidden him.

(*h*) Idem *An.* 483. n. 8. p. 371.

(*i*) Brev. Hiſtor. *Eutych. Lab.* col. 1081.

It is ſo common for the Roman Forgers to invent ſham Epiſtles, in which the Pope is feigned to make Eminent Biſhops his Legates in all parts of the World, that, no doubt, this Popes firſt Epiſtle to *Zeno* Biſhop of *Sevil* (which hath no date) is ſpurious (*k*). And therefore it is of no force, that the Notes infer from ſuch a Forgery, *That the care of the whole Church was committed to the Pope by God.*

(*k*) *Simplic.* Ep. 1. *Bin.* pag 435. *Lab.* Col. 1068.

The 4*th* Epiſtle tells the Emperor, to whom it was writ, *That none doubted of his Orthodox mind, and that he did as certainly imitate* Marcian *and* Leo *in their Faith, as he did ſucceed them in their Empire.* Now this Letter (as *Baronius* and the Editors ſay) was *writ to* Zeno (*l*); and they own it to be at leaſt *prudent diſſimulation*, for the Notes on the Life of *Simplicius* affirm, *Zeno* was an Eutychian Heretick. But indeed it was *inexcuſable Flattery*, or as the Pontifical calls it, downright *Diſſembling:* And the Crime is worſe, becauſe upon a ſtrict enquiry this Epiſtle appears to be writ to that Heretical Uſurper *Baſiliſcus*. *Labbe*'s Margen from an old Manuſcript reads it *to Baſiliſcus*; and *Zeno* really was depoſed a whole year before this Epiſtle was writ; for *Timotheus Ælurus* his coming to *Conſtantinople* (mentioned here by *Simplicius*) was in the time of *Baſiliſcus* after *Zeno*'s depoſition, as an Authentick Author relates (*m*); and the true date of *Simplicius* his Epiſtle ſhews it was writ in *Baſiliſcus* his time, and ſo doth alſo the Chronicle of *Marcellinus*, a Book writ near that time: But for all this, *Baronius* quarrels with *Marcellinus*, contradicts *Theodorus Lector*, alters the date of the Epiſtle, and keeps *Zeno* on the Throne a year longer before his depoſing, than ancient Writers do allow; and all this to conceal his holy Fathers wicked

(*l*) Idem Ep. 4. *Bin.* pag. 436. *Lab.* Col. 1071.

(*m*) *Theodor. Lect. collect.* l. 1. pag. 183.

wicked flattering of an Heretick, and Uſurper (*n*). But I hope the Reader will believe old and diſintereſſed Hiſtorians, before the partial Annaliſt.

(n) *Baron. An.* 476. n. 16. & n. 23. pag. 320, 321.

The *5th* Epiſtle writ at the ſame time to *Acacius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, ſhews that it was ſolely in the Emperors power to call a General Council (*o*). Since *Timothy* of *Alexandria* applied to the Emperor for ſuch a Council, and *Simplicius* with *Acacius* joyned in addreſſes to the Emperor againſt it.

(o) *Simplic.* Ep. 5. *Bin.* pag. 437. *Lab.* col. 1073.

In the Notes on the *8th* Epiſtle, where *Euagrius* only mentioned a bare report of *the Martyr* Theclas *appearing to* Zeno; They out of *Baronius* add, *that ſhe prayed and interceded for* Zeno (*p*): Which invention is to countenance the Martyrs praying for us; The date of this Epiſtle being in *October* 477, and (as the Notes ſay) writ to *Zeno* after he was reſtored, and had ſent to *Simplicius* an Orthodox confeſſion of Faith; This date I ſay ſhews that the *4th* Epiſtle (before ſpoken of) muſt have been written to *Baſiliſcus*; for that is dated in *January* 476, at which time *Zeno* was depoſed, and *Baſiliſcus* after he had reigned two years, as *Euagrius* writes (*q*), was ejected by *Zeno* about *July* 477, long before which time, *Simplicius* had writ that flattering Letter to the Uſurper.

(p) Not. in 8 Epiſt. *Simplic. Bin.* pag. 439. *Lab.* Col. 1079.

(q) Cum jam biennio regnaverat. *Euag.* ap. *Baron. An.* 477. N. *Not Ten Months, as* du Pin *miſtakes.* pag. 160.

The Forgers have corrupted the Title and Concluſion of *Acacius* his Epiſtle to *Simplicius* (r). For *Simplicius* in a genuine Epiſtle calls *Acacius*, *his beloved Brother*, Epiſtle 18: But here by turning *Patriarchæ* into *Patri*, they make *Acacius* ſtyle *Simplicius*, *Moſt bleſſed Lord and Holy Father, Archbiſhop, &c.* Which corruption (owned by *Labbè*) ſhews how little credit is to be given to the Pompous Titles of theſe Epiſtles which are frequently feigned by the modern Roman Paraſites.

(r) *Bin.* p. 439. *Lab.* col. 1080.

Upon the *14th* Epiſtle they note in the Margen, *The Pope diſpenſes with the* Nicene *Canon for peace ſake, and in favour of the Emperor* (s). This relates to the haſty election and ordination of *Stephen* Patriarch of *Antioch*, which the Emperor and *Acacius* were forced to diſpatch ſomewhat uncanonically for fear of a Sedition in that

(s) *Simpl.* Ep. 14. *Bin.* pag 441. *Lab* col. 1086. (malè 1034.)

City, and on that account they deſired the Pope however to own him as an Orthodox Patriarch, ſince they had reſolved this ſingle Example ſhould be no precedent for the future. The Pope like a true *Signior Placebo*, aſſents to all tamely, and allows of their reſolution, which was not (as the Notes on the 15*th* Epiſtle falſly ſay,) any Condition that *Simplicius* preſcribed to the Emperor, but a Rule that *Zeno* had made for himſelf, before the Pope knew of the Ordination of *Stephen*.

The 16*th* Epiſtle declares, *that* Simplicius *had taken* Calendion *the new Biſhop of* Antioch *into his Communion*, and call him *his Brother and Fellow-Biſhop* (t). The Notes calls this, *the Popes confirming* Calendion *in the See of* Antioch: Whereas it was no more than his owning him for an Orthodox Brother; yea, *Calendion* was thus far confirmed by *Acacius*, for (at his requeſt) *Acacius* had declared himſelf of his Communion, before he writ to the Pope. Theſe Notes alſo falſly ſay, Acacius *was made the Popes Legate*, which is a groundleſs Fiction of *Baronius* (u). For if *Acacius* had acted in ordaining and depoſing the Eaſtern Patriarchs, only as the Popes Legate, there had been no Quarrel between him and *Rome*. And how improbable is it, that he who contended for the Supremacy of the whole Eaſtern Church with the Pope, and who is taxed by *Baronius, to be one that thirſted after nothing ſo much as the Primacy* (w), that he, (I ſay) ſhould accept of a Legantine power from *Rome*? Yea, *Simplicius* his 17*th* Epiſtle doth not ſay any ſuch thing, but ſpeaks *of their Obligation to mutual Love*, and of the Patriarchal *Office committed to him, as a Talent God had entruſted him with*: But not a ſyllable of his Subjection to the Pope, or of any Office derived from him.

(t) *Simplic.* Ep. 16. *Bin.* p 442. *Lab.* col. 1036.

(u) *Baron.* An. 482. n. 13. p. 357.

(w) *Baron.* cod. Ann. 3. p. 355.

§. 4. The

§. 4. The Council of *Tours*, *Binius* places here *under Simplicius*, *Labbè* 21 years ſooner under Pope *Hilary*; but the truth is, that it was held *An.* 461. but under no Pope at all: For they deſire no other but their abſent Brethren, (Biſhops of that Province) to confirm their Canons (x) by their conſent. The Notes on this Council mention the Faſts and Vigils, which *Perpetuus* the 6*th* Biſhop of *Tours* inſtituted for his Church, Recorded by an old Hiſtorian of that place (y). And 'tis very plain they differ extreamly from thoſe uſed at *Rome*; which ſhews how unreaſonable it is in the Modern Roman Church, to impoſe their Faſts, Feaſts and other Rites upon all Churches in the World. *An. Dom.* 482.

(x) Concil. *Turon. Bin.* pag. 443. *Lab.* col. 1049.

(y) *Gregor. Turon.* lib. 10. cap. 31. p. 513.

The Council of *Arles*, in the cauſe of *Fauſtus* aſſembled to examin Points of Faith, doth not ſo much as mention the Pope, ſo that ſurely they did not take him for an infallible Judge (z). *Labbè*'s Notes boaſt, that one *De Champs* hath confuted Biſhop *Uſher*'s cenſure of the Epiſtles of *Fauſtus* and *Lucidus*, and of this Council which approved them: But before the Reader credit this, let him hear that moſt learned Primate, who modeſtly excuſes the Council, but ſtrongly proves, that *Fauſtus* was a Semi-pelagian Heretick (a): And if he did not feign the conſent of this and another Council to his Doctrins, this will be one inſtance, that Councils may Err in matters of Faith.

(z) Ap. *Bin.* habetur Anno 524. *Lab.* col. 1041.

(a) *Uſher.* Antiq. Britan. c. 13. pag. 229.

§. 5. *Felix* the Third, who followed *Simplicius*, was much bolder, and openly reproved the Emperor and *Acacius*, for that which he called a Fault: But the Notes falſifie when they ſay, *That in the beginning of his Pontificat, he rejected, proſcribed and curſed the moſt wicked* Zeno's (Henoticon) *Edict for Union, anathematizing all that ſubſcribed it* (b). For *Euagrius* recites this Edict, and neither ſaith *Fœlix* condemned it, nor condemns it himſelf; and *Fœlix* former Letters treat both *Zeno* and *Acacius* with all reſpect, nor do they curſe either of them on the account of this Edict: *Theodorus* *An. Dom.* 483.

(b) Not. in vit. *Fel. Bin.* p. 445. *Lab.* col. 1047.

dorus Lector indeed ſaith, *That when all the Patriarchs beſides agreed to* Zeno's *Edict for Union*, Fœlix *of* Rome [οὐκ ἐκοινώνουν] *joyned not with him* (c). Which only implies, his not communicating with the Emperor in that point: But *Binius* hath improved this into proſcribing, curſing and anathematizing the Edict.

(c) *Theodor.* Lect collect. l.2 pag 190.

The Firſt Epiſtle of *Fœlix* to *Acacius* often calls him *Brother*, which ſhews as if then he did not reject his Communion (*d*); and neither this nor the ſecond to *Zeno*, do at all mention the Emperors Edict for Union, but quarrels only about matters of Juriſdiction, being not ſo much concerned for any Heretical Opinions, as for keeping up his claim to a pretended Supremacy: However ſome ſuſpect both theſe Epiſtles as being without date, and becauſe that to *Acacius* ſeems to contradict *Liberatus* (e): But I think they may be allowed for genuine.

(d) *Fœlix* Ep. 1. *Bin.* pag. 446. *Lab.* col 1049.

(e) *Liberat.* Brev. cap. 15. ap. *Baron. An.* 483. n. 1. p. 370.

The Second Epiſtle to *Zeno* is writ with modeſty, yet wants not good advice. The Pope owning it his Duty to write to the Emperor, upon his coming into the See of *Rome*; and he rather intreats, than either commands or threatens (*f*): But it is certain, if this Epiſtle be genuine, it is not perfect, wanting that account of the *African* Perſecution, which *Euagrius* ſaith was mentioned in this Epiſtle.

(f) *Fœlic.* Ep. 2. *Bin.* pag. 448. *Lab.* col. 1053.

It is ſaid, *Fœlix* writ three Letters to *Petrus Cnapheus* the Heretical Biſhop of *Antioch*, of which only two are extant, and it is well if both be not Forgeries [*incepi ſententiare contra te,*] is a Phraſe that ſmells of the later Ages, when the Flatterers of *Rome* coyned great variety of this kind of Epiſtles to make the World think, that an Heretical Patriarch could be depoſed by none but the Pope (*g*). But this very Letter owns, that *Acacius* and his Council had alſo depoſed this *Peter* of *Antioch*, as well as the Pope and his: And *Baronius* ſaith, *Acacius* did it firſt (*h*): But the Cardinal thought it worth his while to corrupt this ſuſpicious Epiſtle, wherein *Fœlix* ſaith, *He was condemned by me, and thoſe who together with me do govern the Apoſtolical Throne*: Which

(g) Ep. 4. *Fœlix, Bin.* pag. 452. *Lab.* col. 1067.

(h) *Baron. An.* 483. n. 54. p. 382.

Which Phraſe plainly ſhews, that the Pope did not Rule alone as a Monarch at *Rome*, but the Italian Biſhops had a ſhare in that Power: To avoid which Truth *Baronius* and they that follow him falſifie it, and read *—condemned by me, and by them, who being conſtituted under me, govern Epiſcopal Seats* (i). The true reading implies the Biſhops are co-ordinate with the Pope, but the Corruption is to make us believe, they are only his creatures, ſubſtitutes and delegates.

(i) *Baron. An.* 483. n. 68. pag. 385.

The Fifth Epiſtle to *Zeno* ſpeaks honourably of *Acacius*, as an Orthodox Archbiſhop, commending him for oppoſing *Petrus Cnapheus* (k): It is noted by a learned Man, that (excepting fabulous Inſcriptions,) the name [Archbiſhop] is here firſt found among the Latins: But I rather obſerve, that *Fœlix* here reads that famous Text for the Supremacy, *Math.* xvi. in this manner—*and upon this Confeſſion will I build my Church:* So it is read often in *Gelaſius* Epiſtles (*l*), *—on the Confeſſion of* Peter *will I build my Church:* Which ſhews it is not a caſual expreſſion, but a Teſtimony that at *Rome* it ſelf, in that Age, it was not believed this Promiſe belonged ſo much to St. *Peter*'s Perſon as to his Faith, nor to his Succeſſors any longer than they held that Confeſſion. Of the *6th* Epiſtle we ſhall ſpeak when we come to *Fœlix* his ſecond Roman Council.

(k) *Fœlic.* Ep. 5. *Bin.* pag. 452. *Lab.* col. 1070.

(l) *Gelaſ.* Ep. 1. *Bin.* 466. *Lab.* 1151. & Ep. 4. *Bin.* 471. *Lab.* 1171.

The Corrupters Fingers have been buſie with the Title of the *7th* Epiſtle, which (as *Labbè* notes out of *Juſtellus*) was writ only *to the Biſhops of* Sicily; but they who are to ſupport an Univerſal Supremacy have changed it thus, *To all Biſhops* (m): And the date is falſified alſo, being pretended to be writ by a Roman Council held in *March, An. Dom.* 487. yet it is dated in the year after, *March* 488. But if they will have it genuine, let them obſerve, that the Pope here ſaith, (ſpeaking of a Point of Faith,) *He knows not but in this caſe, the Spirit of God may have informed them of ſomething that had eſcaped his Knowledge,* promiſing to hear them, if they can find any thing omitted by him (*n*). Let them read this, and reconcile it with Infallibility if they can.

(m) *Fœlic.* Ep. 7. *Bin.* pag. 454. *Lab.* col. 1075.

(n) Ibid. Ep. 7. *Bin.* pag. 455. *Lab.* col. 1077.

The

The Decree of *Fælix* about the ſubjection of Kings to Biſhops, is neither agreeable to the Age, nor to the Style of this Popes other Writings to the Emperor (*o*); ſo that we cannot credit it, though *Labbè* hath put it into an Epiſtle to *Zeno*, becauſe this Epiſtle ſpeaks of the depoſition of *Acacius* as a thing paſt, *Auguſt 1ſt* 484: But the Margen of the next Epiſtle ſaith, Acacius *was depoſed* July 28, 488 (*p*). And it is probable, that both the Sentence and the Synod are ſpurious, coyned out of a hint in the Pontifical, *viz. That* Fœlix *did condemn* Acacius *in a Synod:* Which was ground enough for the Paraſites to frame a Council. But how little credit is to be given to the Pontifical in this Popes Hiſtory, *Baronius* declares, when he notes that Author is not to be truſted in his Report, That *Miſenus* and *Vitalis* were ſent to *Conſtantinople*, three years after this Synod at *Rome* (q). And it ſeems neither *Euphemius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, nor Pope *Gelaſius* knew of this Roman Synod: For when *Euphemius* asked, *In what Synod his Predeceſſor* Acacius *was condemned? Gelaſius* mentions no Roman Synod (*r*); but ſaith, there was no need of any particular Council, ſince he was condemned by the general Sentence of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and upon that ground the Roman Church rejected *Acacius* his Communion.

(o) *Bin.* pag. 455. *Lab.* Ep. 9. col. 1083.

(p) *Fælic.* Ep. 10. ap. *Lab.* col. 1085.

(q) Vit. *Fælic.* 3. *Bin.* pag 445. *Lab.* col. 1046.

(r) *Gelaſ.* ep. 10. & *Baron. An.* 484. n. 21. pag. 395.

There are (in *Labbè*) divers other Epiſtles aſcribed to *Fælix*; one to *Zeno* (s), ſaid to be writ ſome time after the death of *Acacius*, wherein the Pope extols that Emperour for his care of Religion, and the reverence of Divine Worſhip; which ſhews that *Fælix* did not ſo ſtifly renounce *Zeno*'s Communion, nor damn his Edict for Union ſo ſeverely as *Binius* pretends. The reſt of theſe Epiſtles I paſs, though moſt of them be ſuſpicious.

(s) *Fælic.* ep. 12. *Lab.* col. 1086.

§. 6. The

§.6. The firſt Roman Council under *Fælix*, may be true as far as concerns the Condemnation of *Peter Mongus*, the Heretical Biſhop of *Alexandria* (t), though there is nothing to prove it, but the two firſt ſuſpected Epiſtles of *Fælix*. However, if there were ſuch a Synod, it ſhews how little regard was had to the Pope and his Council in thoſe days, ſince *John*, whoſe ſide *Rome* took, did never get admittance to the See of *Alexandria*; and *Peter Mongus* kept that Chair for all the Popes Sentence: And if the other, *Peter Cnapheus*, the Heretical Biſhop of *Antioch* was condemned here, it is certain, he was condemned before by *Acacius* at *Conſtantinople*: But that Evidence of *Acacius* his being Orthodox, hath not diſcouraged the Paraſites from forging a pretended Citation, in the name of this Roman Synod, to call *Acacius* to *Rome*, there to anſwer the Matters charged againſt him: But 'tis ſo improbable, *Fælix* ſhould attempt this againſt one, who thought himſelf his equal, if not ſuperior, that now-a-days the Romaniſts allow not theſe Proceſſes, but count them ſpurious. *An. Dom.* 483. (t) Concil. Rom. 1. *Bin.* pag 455. *Lab.* col. 1095.

There is a ſecond Roman Council placed in this year, wherein *Acacius* and the two *Peters* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* are all ſaid to be condemned (u). But let it be noted, that whereas the *6th* Epiſtle of *Fælix* ſaith, *he had depoſed* Acacius *in a Synod in* Auguſt, 484 (w), and at that time *Baronius* places his depoſition (x); Yet here we have a Synodical Letter, condemning him over again, dated above a year after, *viz. Octob.* 485, which Date *Baronius* and *Binius* fraudulently leave out (y): But *Labbè* ſets it down in the Margen, and ſo diſcovers the cheat (z). Upon the whole matter, this Condemnation of *Acacius* was done they know not when; and 'tis probable all theſe Letters and Synods were invented after the Controverſie for precedence between *Rome* and *Conſtantinople* grew high, meerly to put weight into the Roman Scale. But one corruption of this ſuſpicious Synodical E- *An. Dom.* 484 (u) Concil. 2. Rom. *Bin.* pag. 462. *Lab.* col. 1123. (w) *Fælic.* Ep. 6. *Bin.* pag. 454. *Lab.* col. 1075. (x) *Baron. An.* 484 n. 30. pag. 397. (y) *Bin.* pag. 463. (z) *Lab.* col. 1127.

piſtle I cannot paſs, being a paſſage evidently put in by a later Forger: For whereas this Letter makes the Italian Biſhops *call the Pope their Prince and Head* (by way of limitation,) *who ought to preſide in the Synods of* Italy: — And tell thoſe to whom they writ — that *therefore they had by* Tutus *ſent the Sentence underneath, which pleaſed the Synod at St.* Peters, *and which holy* Fœlix *their Head, Pope and Archbiſhop had decreed:* Some later Hand hath broken the Senſe, and abſurdly thruſt into the midſt of this Sentence theſe incoherent words — *Who is the Head of all; the Lord ſaying to St.* Peter *the Apoſtle, Thou art* Peter, &c. Math. xvi. *Which words the* 318 *Fathers at* Nice *following, gave the Authority and Confirmation of matters to the holy Church of* Rome, *both which, even to our Age, all Succeſſions by the grace of Chriſt have kept,* — and then comes in — *Therefore (as we have ſaid,) we have by* Tutus *ſent, &c.* (*a*). 'Tis plain they are forced to put in theſe words (as we have ſaid) to tye theſe latter words to the former: And whoever conſiders the incoherence, the impertinence, the ſham ſtory of the Fathers at *Nice*, and the many Ages ſuppoſed, from that Council of *Nice* to this time, (which was but barely 160 years) will conclude this Paſſage is a Corruption upon a Corruption, to ſupport the Supremacy, while ſuch ſtuff paſſed for Authentick proof to an ignorant Age.

(*a*) Ep. Synod. *Bin.* pag. 463. *Lab.* col. 1126.

An. Dom. 488. The Third Roman Council under *Fœlix*, (as we noted on his 7*th* Epiſtle) lies under the ſame ſuſpicion, being dated with the Conſuls of the year 488, yet is ſaid to be read in Council the year before, *An.* 487; and from an Epiſtle to one Neighbouring Country, is now made a *Letter to all Biſhops.*

An. Dom. 492. §. 7. *Gelaſius* ſucceeded *Fœlix* in the Roman See, a man of more wit and learning than moſt of his Predeceſſors, for which cauſe it is thought he was called *Scholaſticus* before St. *Gregory*'s time, and that it was he that corrected and ſet out the Roman Offices. The Pontifical relates, that *the Manichees being diſcovered at* Rome

Rome *in his time*, he made a Decree, *That thoſe who would not receive the Sacrament in both kinds, ſhould receive it in neither, and declares it to be a grand Sacriledge for any to divide the holy Myſteries* (b). Now theſe Hereticks refuſing the Cup, were to be diſcovered by the Prieſts taking care that all the People received the Cup as well as the Bread: But this happens to condemn the modern uſe at *Rome*, (of denying the Cup to the People) as a grand Sacriledge; wherefore all Hands and Wits are at work to ward off this fatal Blow. *Binius* in his Margen feigns, *That* Gelaſius *ordered the Sacrament to be received in both kinds for a time:* But if it had not been the Cuſtom at *Rome* to receive in both kinds before, the Manichees had never been diſcovered: It is very plain *Gelaſius* confirms the old Cuſtom, and thinks it in all times a Sacriledge to receive but one half: Wherefore *Labbè* hath left out this pitiful Note. The *Editors* of *Gratian* cover this blot, by Forging this falſe Title to the Decree, *The Prieſt ought not to receive the Body of Chriſt without the Blood* (c). But *Gelaſius* ſpeaks principally, if not only of the People, and this Senſe ſuppoſes moſt of the Roman Clergy to be Manichean Hereticks. Therefore *Baronius* rejects this Excuſe as frivolous (*d*), but takes as bad a method to ſalve up this buſineſs; for he manifeſtly perverts the ſenſe of the Decree, ——*pretending the Manichees ſuperſtition made it Sacriledge only in them to reject the Cup*; but it is none in the Catholick People not to receive it, nor in the Church to forbid it: But this is meer Shophiſtry, for it was certainly the Cuſtom even at *Rome* in *Gelaſius* his time, and many Ages after, for all the Orthodox People to receive in both kinds; and he calls it Sacriledge in any of the People, who did not receive the Cup as well as the Bread: For he ſaith in general, *This dividing the Myſtery, can never happen without a grand Sacriledge.* Now it is certain, that when either an Heretical or Catholick Man or Woman receives but in one kind, it doth happen that the Myſtery is divided; and there-

(b) Vit. *Gelaſ.* *Bin.* pag. 464. *Lab.* col. 1154.

(c) *Gratian.* decr. 3 par. de conſec. diſt. 2. cap. 12. p. 710.

(d) *Baron. An.* 496 n. 21. pag. 510.

fore in Pope *Gelaſius* Opinion, the preſent Church of *Rome* is guilty of a grand Sacriledge, in taking the Cup from the People: And it ſeems, the Editors thought *Baronius* had not ſufficiently ſatisfied this Objection, and therefore they cunningly leave it out of this Popes Decrees (*e*), in both Editions.

(e) *Bin.* pag. 493 *Lab.* col. 1258.

With like craft, they omit the Tract of *Gelaſius* againſt *Eutyches*, and only give a touch at it in the Notes (*f*); and there alſo care is taken (out of *Baronius*,) if any ſhall elſewhere meet with this piece, to keep them from diſcerning, that Pope *Gelaſius* condemns Tranſubſtantiation; and expreſly ſaith, *That the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine remains, after the Conſecration:* The words they cannot deny; but firſt, *Baronius* and *Binius* argue it was not writ by this Pope, but by *Gelaſius Cyzicenus*, (an Author as Orthodox and more ancient than Pope *Gelaſius*; but their Arguments are not ſo cogent, as to outweigh the proofs that this Pope writ the Tract. *Labbè* in his Margen ſaith, *that many learned men think it his.* *Gennadius* Contemporary with the Roman *Gelaſius*, and the Pontifical ſay, he writ a Tract againſt *Eutyches: Fulgentius* cites it as this *Gelaſius* his Work (*g*): Pope *John* the Second, alſo aſcribes it to his Predeceſſor: Yea, the *Bibliotheca Patrum* allowed by the Expurgators, put it out under Pope *Gelaſius* his name (*h*). And at laſt, *Baronius* himſelf is not againſt ſuppoſing it was his. But then Secondly, He manifeſtly perverts the Senſe of the words before-cited, being (after long ſhuffling) forced to this abſurdity, that ——— *by the ſubſtance, he means, the accidents of Bread and Wine remain* (i); Which makes this learned Pope ſo ignorant, as to miſtake the firſt rudiments of Logick, and might almoſt ſhew he was an Heretick, if his Compariſon in that ſenſe be applied to the two Natures of Chriſt, for illuſtrating of which he brings it in: For thus it would follow, that *Gelaſius* held, *nothing but the accidents of Chriſts Body or Human Nature, remained after the Hypoſtatical Union:* Doubtleſs, *Contarenus* his Brother Car-

(f) Not. in vit. *Gelaſ. Bin.* pag. 465. *Lab.* col. 1156.

(g) *Fulgent.* da *Ferrand.* Diac. cap. 18.

(h) Bibl. Patr. Edit. Paris. Tom. 4. p. 522.

(i) *Baron. An.* 496. n. 1. pag. 506, & n. 14. pag. 508.

Cardinal, was wiſer and honeſter in making no reply at the Colloquy of *Ratiſbon* 1541, to this clear Teſtimony: And it is great weakneſs in *Baronius*, to brag what wonders he hath done, by heaping up a parcel of falſhoods and impertinence. Before we diſmiſs this, let it be noted, that the Annaliſt and *Binius* not only allow, but diſpute for 500 forged Tracts and Epiſtles, which ſupport modern Popery; but they deviſe innumerable things, to baffle and diſgrace the moſt genuine Writings that condemn their Innovations: Which is *Baronius* his meaning, when he gives this reaſon of his large digreſſion about this Tract,——*becauſe out of it the Innovators take their Weapons:* But they who reject the old Writings of their own Doctors, do more juſtly deſerve that Title.

As to this Popes extraction, *Volatteran* and *Panvinius* ſay, ——*his Father* Valerius *was a Biſhop:* Which is now left out of the Pontifical, and not mentioned in *Baronius* or the Notes *(k)*: But the omiſſion ſignifies little, there being ſo many inſtances of married Biſhops that had Children; Yea, of Popes that were Sons, or Grand-Children of Biſhops or former Popes: As to the time of this Pope's ingreſs, *Baronius* places it *An.*492, and upon the credit of the dates of a few Papal Epiſtles, (which are always ſuſpicious and often forged,) he rejects the Authority of *Marcellinus*, who lived at this time, and died *An.*534 *(l)*; in whoſe Chronicle *Gelaſius* is ſaid to be made Pope *An.*494; that is, two year later than *Baronius* places it.

(k) Not. in vit. *Gelaſ. Bin.* pag. 465. *Lab.* col. 1156. *Baron. An.*492. n.6. p.460.

(l) *Baron.* An. 492 n.6. p.461.

§. 8. If *Marcellinus* be in the right, we may juſtly doubt of thoſe three Epiſtles, [the *1ſt*, *2d* and *9th*,] which *Baronius* cites as writ before the year 494: The *1ſt* hath no date, and though the time of writing it be made an Evidence againſt *Marcellinus* his Account; yet he brings no proof it was writ *An.*492, but this, *Nothing hinders us from allowing theſe things between* Euphemius *and* Gelaſius, *to be done this year* (m). I reply, the Teſtimony of a good Author of that Age,

(m) *Baron. An.* 492. n.27. pag. 465.

Age, who affirms *Gelaſius* was not Pope till two years after, hinders us from believing it was writ then: But I will not however condemn the Epiſtle, which is modeſt enough, calling *Euphemius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, ——*his Brother and Fellow, advanced to a Precedence by the favour of Chriſt* (n): And when he was preſſed to declare, by what Council *Acacius* was condemned, he cites no Roman Council, nor pretended Sentence of his Predeceſſor *Fœlix*: But ſaith, he was condemned by the Council of *Chalcedon*; but this he doth not make out.

(n) *Gelaſ.* ep. 1. *Bin* pag. 466. *Lab.* col 1157.

The Second Epiſtle alſo wants a date, and is by gueſs placed in this year by *Baronius*, with this falſe remark, *That the Popes by Cuſtom uſed to preſcribe a Form of Belief to all the Faithful* (o): Whereas the Letter it ſelf declares the Cuſtom was,——*For every new Pope to declare his Faith to the Neighbouring Biſhops, that they might know he was Orthodox* (p). Now there is a vaſt difference, between preſcribing a Form of Belief to others, and labouring to get from them a Teſtimony of our believing aright.

(o) *Baron. An.* 492. n. 30. pag. 466.

(p) *Gelaſ.* ep. 2. *Bin.* pag. 468. *Lab.* col. 1163.

The 4*th* Epiſtles true Title is, *The Monitory of* Gelaſius: But in *Binius* theſe words, [*Of the moſt bleſſed Pope*] are added (q), which *Labbè* rightly omits: In the Monitory it ſelf obſerve, Firſt, That *Gelaſius* denies his Predeceſſor or he had condemned the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*. Secondly, He ſaith, the Church hath no power to abſolve any after their death. Thirdly, He claims no power to make any new Canons, but only to execute the old. Which other Biſhops may do. Fourthly, He cannot prove Appeals to *Rome* by any Canons, but thoſe of *Sardica*, which were rejected by many, and ſlights the Canons of *Chalcedon*, received every where but at *Rome*. Fifthly, He very falſly pretends, *Acacius* was only the Executer of the Roman Churches Sentence, by whoſe ſole Authority ſome Eaſtern Biſhops were condemned. But we know, *Acacius* had condemned them long before any Sentence was given at *Rome* (r), and ſcorned to act under the Pope. Sixthly, Where *Gelaſius* in his own Cauſe vainly brags, *That the Canons have given the Judgment*

(q) *Gelaſ.* ep. 4. *Bin* pag. 470. *Lab.* col. 1168.

(r) *Baron. An.* 483. n. 54. pag. 382.

over

over all to the Apoſtolical Seat: Binius and *Labbè* mend it in their Marginal Note, and ſay, *The Canons and Chriſt gave it this power* (s); neither of which is true.

(s) Ep 4. in marg. verſus finem.

In the 5*th* Epiſtle, *Gelaſius* owns a Private Biſhop for *his Brother*, and declares, that *he himſelf cannot alter the Canons.* The Margen again here ſaith, *The Canons cannot be altered* (t), —they ſhould have ſaid ——*no not by the Pope:* But here they ſay too little, as before they ſaid too much; which puts me in mind of *Juvenal*'s Note,

(t) *Gelaſ.* ep. 5. *Bin* pag. 472. *Lab.* col. 1172.

Quiſquam hominum eſt quem tu contentum videris uno
Flagitio —— ——

You never knew a ſingle Sin
Content Men, when their Hands are in.

The Date of this Epiſtle muſt be falſe, being *An.* 490, that is, two years before (as they reckon) *Gelaſius* was Pope. *Labbè* would mend it, by antedating the entrance of *Gelaſius*, forgetting that he had printed an Epiſtle of *Fœlix* to *Thalaſſius*, dated that year (u); his Invention therefore was better than his Memory.

(u) *Lab.* col. 1092.

The 6*th* Epiſtle ſhews, that notwithſtanding the Popes fair pretences to an Univerſal Juriſdiction, his neighbour Biſhops in *Dalmatia* did not own it; but looked on him as a buſie-body, for meddling in their affairs (w), and ſuſpected the Snake of Uſurpation lay under the florid Leaves of his ſeeming care of all the Churches.

(w) *Gelaſ.* ep. 6. *Bin.* pag. 472. *Lab.* col. 1173.

The 7*th* Epiſtle is briefly and imperfectly ſet down by *Baronius* (x), becauſe he would conceal from his Reader, that *Gelaſius* makes *Purgatory* and *Limbus Infantum* a Pelagian Opinion; *Let them* (ſaith he (y)) *take away that third place, which they have made* [recipiendis parvulis] *for receiving little Children. And ſince we read of no more, but the right hand and left, let them not make them ſtay on the left hand for want of Baptiſm, but permit them by the Baptiſm of Regeneration to paſs to the right.*—— Which illuſtrious Teſtimony the Editors would obſcure by reading, [*decipiendis parvulis*] *for deceiving Children:*

(x) *Baron. An.* 493 n. 36. pag. 478.
(y) *Gelaſ.* ep. 7. *Bin.* pag. 474. *Lab.* col. 1178.

But

But if that were the true Reading, it ſhews, this Pope thought none but Children and Fools would believe a Third place invented by the Pelagians; ſince Scripture ſpeaks but of two, *viz.* Heaven and Hell.

It is a trifling Note on this Epiſtle, *That* Gelaſius *admoniſhed ſome Biſhops of* Italy *againſt Pelagianiſm, not fearing two Princes, one of which was an Eutychian, the other an Arrian Heretick* (z). For what cared theſe Princes for the Popes Letters, againſt the Hereſies of others, ſo long as he let them alone, and never admoniſhed them of their own Hereſies?

(z) Not. in Ep. 7. *Bin.* pag. 476. *Lab.* col. 1181.

The 8*th* Epiſtle was writ to one of theſe Heretical Princes, *viz.* to *Anaſtaſius*; and the Pope is ſcandalouſly ſilent about his Hereſie, nor doth he once reprove his Errors in the Faith; but only labours, even by falſe pretences to juſtifie his Supremacy, which gave too juſt a ground for that Emperor and his Eaſtern Biſhops, to tax this Pope of ſecular Pride, a fault very viſible in all his Writings on this Subject. Further we may note, that this Epiſtle was of old inſcribed thus, *Biſhop* Gelaſius *to the moſt glorious Emperor* Anaſtaſius (*a*); but the Editors have left out the Emperor's Epithet, for fear he ſhould look bigger than the Pope: Alſo, where the Pope *prays that no Contagion may ſtain his See*, and hopes it never will (*b*); which plainly ſuppoſes, *it was poſſible* Rome *might Err*; otherwiſe he had mocked God, in praying againſt that which could not happen; and aſſurance had left no place for hope, if the Popes were abſolutely Infallible: Yet here the Marginal Note is, *The Apoſtolical See cannot Err*: Which may caution the Reader, not to truſt their Margent nor Index, for *there is often more in the Inſcription, than can be found in the Box.*

(a) *Gelaſ.* Ep. 8. *Bin.* & *Lab.* ut ſupra.

(*b*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 476. *Lab* col. 1183.

The 9*th* Epiſtle being dated *An.* 494. was odly cited by *Baronius*, to prove that *Gelaſius* was made Pope in *An.* 492. (*c*): It ſeems to be a Collection of divers Canons put together, no Body knows by what Pope. And one thing is very ſtrange, that whereas the Preface owns, *the Clergy were almoſt ſtarved in many of the*

(c) *Baron. An.* 492. n. 6. p. 461.

the Churches of Italy (*d*); Yet the Epiſtle impertinently takes great care, that the Rents be divided into four parts, as if all things had then been as plentiful as ever: And whereas theſe Rules are ſent to the Biſhops of *Lucania* near *Naples*, the Pope's forbidding them to dedicate Churches without his Licence, is by the Marginal Note made a General Rule for all Countries; but falſly, ſince the Biſhops of the Eaſt, of *Afric*, *Gaul*, *&c.* did never ask the Popes Licence in that Age, to conſecrate Churches.

(d) *Gelaſ.* ep. 9. *Bin.* pag. 478. *Lab.* col. 1188.

The 13*th* Epiſtle is a bold attempt toward an Univerſal Supremacy (*e*): For *Gelaſius* finding the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* at his Heels, and come up almoſt to a level with him, uſes his utmoſt effort to make a few Raſcian Biſhops believe he was ſet over the whole Church: But he ſhews more Art and Learning, than Truth or Honeſty in this Argument, aſſerting theſe downright Falſhoods. Firſt, That the Canons order all the World to Appeal to *Rome*, and ſuffer none to Appeal from thence: But *Bellarmin* (knowing theſe Canons where thoſe deſpicable ones of *Sardica*, and that even thoſe did not intend to oblige the whole World,) in citing this paſſage, changes *Canones appellari voluerint*, into *appellandum eſt* (f): So that he chuſes to leave it indefinite, *that all muſt appeal to Rome*, rather than undertake to tell us (with *Gelaſius*,) how that See came by this Right. Secondly, That the Roman Church by its ſingle Authority abſolved *Athanaſius*, *Chryſoſtom* and *Flavian*, and condemned *Dioſcorus*, (as this little Pope brags); which is as true as it is, *that the Roman Church alone decreed the Council of* Chalcedon *ſhould be received, ſhe alone pardoned the Biſhops that lapſed in the Epheſine latrociny, and by her Authority caſt out the obſtinate:* Which this Epiſtle audaciouſly aſſerts, though there are more untruths than lines in the whole paſſage: And if liberty be not deny'd us, we appeal to all the Authentic Hiſtorians of thoſe Ages, who utterly confute theſe vain brags. Yet *Bellarmin* adds to this extravagant pretence of *Romes*

(e) *Gelaſ.* ep. 13. *Bin.* pag. 483. *Lab.* col.

(f) *Bellarm.* de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 17. pag. 98.

alone decreeing the Council of Chalcedon, (theſe words) *by her ſingle Authority* (g): But *Launoy* bluſhes for him, and ſays, *what* Gelaſius *here ſaith is not ſtrictly true*, and that he needs a very benign Interpreter (*h*); that is, one who *will not call a Spade a Spade:* But let this Pope's aſſertions be never ſo falſe, they ſerve to advance the ends of the Roman Supremacy; and therefore you ſhall find no more of this long Epiſtle in the Annals, but only this hectoring paſſage (*i*). Though he unluckily confeſſeth immediately after, *that* Gelaſius *did no manner of good with all this* (k). And no wonder, ſince that Age, as well as this, knew his pretences were unjuſt, his reaſoning fallacious, and his inſtances falſe. Thirdly, He aſſerts, that Pope *Leo* vacated the Canons of *Chalcedon:* 'Tis true, he did it as far as lay in him, who meaſured Right only by Intereſt: But we have ſhewed they remained in full force, in all other parts of the Church, notwithſtanding his diſſent openly declared. Fourthly, He affirms, that the care of all the Churches about *Conſtantinople* was given to *Acacius* by the Apoſtolick See: Which is, (as hath been proved) a notorious Falſhood; of which this Epiſtle is ſo full, that one would ſuſpect it was the Off-ſpring of a much later Age. 'Tis certain, the Title is very unuſual, Gelaſius *Biſhop of the City of* Rome, *&c.* And the date is falſe, the Conſul named is *Victor*, whoſe year was 70 year before: *Baronius* and the Editors of their own head mend it, and read [*Viator*;] and *Labbè* tells us in the Margin, *that ſome things are wanting* (*in this Epiſtle,*) *and ſome are read otherways in* Juſtellus *Manuſcript* (l): And again he obſerves, that inſtead of theſe words, *Apoſtolicæ ſedi frequentèr datum eſt*,——it is now read, *Apoſtolica ſedes frequentèr ut dictum eſt, &c.* which makes a great alteration in the Senſe: The former implying only a delegated power, the later an original power of abſolving all perſons: So that if the whole be not a Forgery, yet it is now corrupted in many places, by the bold Champions of the Supremacy, to whom nothing was Sacred; Yea, we are told it comes out of the Vatican Mint, *reſtored and mended,* (we know what that

(g) *Bel.* de Concil. lib. 1. c. 13. pag. 24.
(h) *Launoy* lib. 5 ep. 4. pag 518.
(i) *Baron. An.* 495. n. 2, 3. pag. 500.
(k) Ibid. n. 5.
(l) *Lab.* marg. Col. 1200.

that means,) *as far as was fit by* Baronius (*m*). So that the Impartial Reader may judge what credit is to be given to this Epiſtle (out of which they often prove their Supremacy) written by a bigotted Pope (who ſcrupled not at any thing to advance his See) if it be genuine, and tranſcribed by ſuch as are convicted of repeated Corruptions.

(m) *Baron. An.* 495. n. 1. p. 500.

Labbè gives us two other imperfect Epiſtles of *Gelaſius*, about his renouncing Communion with thoſe who kept *Acacius* his Name in their Dypticks, as moſt of the Eaſtern Biſhops then did (*n*). But in theſe the Pope humbly ſaith, *It is not for my Humility to paſs Sentence concerning a difference reaching through the World, my part being to take care of my own Salvation* (o). Which is ſo different from the ſtyle of his former Epiſtles, that if theſe be genuine thoſe are ſuſpicious.

(n) *Gelaſ.* ep. 14 & 15. *Lab.* col. 1212.

(o) Ib. *Lab.* col. 1214.

But ſince all theſe Epiſtles of *Simplicius*, *Fælix* and *Gelaſius*, make ſo foul a matter of *Acacius* his Caſe, let me once for all here give his Character, and ſtate that buſineſs. That he was Orthodox in all points is manifeſt by his Epiſtle againſt *Peter* of *Antioch* (p): And by his forcing *Baſiliſcus* to revoke his Edict againſt the Council of *Chalcedon* (q). And while the Pope flattered that Heretical Uſurper, *Acacius* made all the Biſhops who had ſubſcribed it, recant (*r*). He alſo ejected *Peter* of *Antioch* for Hereſie, before the Pope knew of it, and excommunicated *Peter* of *Alexandria*, yea, depoſed him when he maintained his Hereſie (*s*): And would not admit him to Communion again till he had profeſſed the Catholic Faith, and by name expreſly received the Council of *Chalcedon* (t). 'Tis true, this Biſhop proved himſelf a Diſſembler by Apoſtatizing afterward; but that was not the Popes Quarrel at *Acacius*, the Roman Biſhops were jealous of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* growing power, who flouriſhed under the Eaſtern Emperors, while their Church was obſcured under a Barbarous King: And *Acacius* by the Emperors conſent (without conſulting the Pope (*u*), put in and put out the Eaſtern Biſhops as he thought fit, pretending this power was given him

(p) *Lab.* col. 1107.

(q) *Euagr.* Hiſt. lib. 3. cap. 7.

(r) Id. ib. cap. 9.

(s) Liberati Brev. cap. 16, 17.

(t) Epiſt. *Petr.* Al. apud *Euagr.* lib. 3. cap. 17.

(u) *Libera.* Brev. ut ſupr.

by the Councils of *Conſtantinople* and *Chalcedon:* This galled the Popes, and therefore in the pretended Sentence of *Fælix*, he is charged as one *that uſurped others Provinces contrary to the* Nicene *Canons.* This check'd the univerſal Supremacy that *Rome* had then been for ſome time aiming at, ſo that they could have forgiven any Hereſie rather than this attempt: Which appears by this, That though Pelagianiſm had ſpread it ſelf all over the Weſtern Church, and *Eutyches* Hereſie prevailed in the Eaſt, yea, a great part of *Rome* it ſelf was Arrian, we find few or no Popes Letters againſt theſe Violators of the Faith, as if they (with *Tiberius*) left *Chriſt to revenge his own injuries* (w). But all their outcry is againſt *Acacius*, whom they would never forgive living nor dead, for touching their Juriſdiction, that was dearer to them than all the Articles of their Creed. But while they hated him, the whole Eaſtern Church took his part, and he continued to exerciſe his Office (in ſpight of all the Popes Sentences) until his death, leaving behind him ſo good a Character, that *Suidas* ſaith, *If ever any man were truly venerable it was Acacius* (x). Yea, it was a long time before the Greeks could be perſuaded either by the promiſes or threatnings of *Rome* to put his Name out of the Dypticks, though the union of the Eaſt and Weſt depended at laſt upon that ſingle Point. They objected, that he ſubſcribed the Edict for Union made by *Zeno*. I reply, ſo did three Patriarchs more, and that Edict contained no Hereſie, nor did it condemn the Council of *Chalcedon.* They urge alſo, *that he rejected* John Talaia *an Orthodox Biſhop of Alexandria:* But that was becauſe he believed him perjured, and conſequently unduly elected. To conclude, *Acacius* was a good Man, and thoſe who will conſider the matter impartially, will think the Popes deſerve no commendation for their ſtiffneſs and violence in this Conteſt.

(w) Deorum injuriæ Diis curæ. Dict. *Tiber. Aug.*

(x) *Suidas* in (*Acatio.*)

After

After the Epiſtles follow ſome Tracts of *Gelaſius*; The firſt of which is about *Excommunication*: Wherein there is one paſſage that afflicts *Baronius*; For the Pope ſaith, *Chriſt hath ſeparated the Kings Office and the Biſhops; So that Biſhops muſt not challenge Royal Dignity nor meddle in ſecular Affairs, nor may Kings adminiſter Holy things* (y). But the Cardinal will have the Roman Biſhop to have at leaſt Regal Power, and Kings to be ſubject to Eccleſiaſticks, who he thinks may meddle in Temporal Affairs, tho' Kings muſt not in Sacred matters; citing for this an Epiſtle of *Gelaſius* (z). But I ſhould rather think the Epiſtle forged if it did contradict this Tract, tho' *Baronius* wreſts the words he cites, and omits a paſſage that immediately follows them, *viz. The Eccleſiaſtical Rulers obey your Laws* (a); which ſhews Biſhops were then ſubject to Princes.

(y) Tract. 1. *G. l. Bin.* pag. 489. *Lab.* col. 1232.

(z) *Baron. An.* 496. n. 25. pag. 511.

(a) *Gelaſ.* ep. 8. *Bin.* pag. 476. *Lab.* col. 1182.

And the next Tract [*againſt the profane Pagan Feſtivals*] ſhews that the Pope had no ſhadow of Regal power at *Rome* in thoſe days; For *Gelaſius* only declares them unlawful, and ſaith he will deliver his own Soul in perſuading the Chriſtians to forbear them: But it was the Senates part to forbid them and take them away, and his Predeceſſors were to Petition the Emperor (as he owns) to aboliſh ſuch impieties (*b*). So that *Baronius* his huffing Preface to this argument againſt theſe Paganiſh Feaſts is very ridiculous. *You may ſee* (ſaith he) *how he exalts himſelf againſt the Emperor; and though the City was under a* Gothic *King, he preſcribes Laws to* Rome *without asking leave of an Impious Prince* (c). He hath good Eyes (I am ſure) who in this Sermon or Diſcourſe can ſee either any exerciſe of Authority or Law preſcribed, only indeed it is a pious and rational exhortation.

(b) Tract. 2. *Gel. Bin.* pag. 492. *Lab.* col. 1239.

(c) *Baron. An.* 496. n. 27. pag. 512.

§. 9. A Roman Council under *Gelaſius* is placed next, ſaid to conſiſt of 70 Biſhops, convened to ſettle the Canon of Scripture, and to diſtinguiſh genuine from ſpurious Authors (*d*). But the whole ſeems a meer Forgery: For, firſt, the Publiſhers are not agreed upon what Pope to Father it: Divers Manuſcripts in *Labbè*, aſcribe it to *Hormiſda* (who ſat 20 Years after this (*e*). Another

An. Dom. 494.

(d) Concil. 1. Rom. *Bin* pag. 500. *Lab.* col. 1260.

(e) *Lab.* ibid. & in *Hormiſd.* col. 1557.

Another very old Book calls it, *A Declaration of Holy Scripture, &c.* with *Gelaſius his Annotations* (f). The Decree in *Gratian* and in *Juſtellus* his Manuſcript wants *all the Books of the Old and New Teſtament* (g). Wherein alſo, *all the ſtuff about the Primacy, and the order of Patriarchs is omitted:* Yea, the Notes in *Gratian* own, that formerly it went no further than to—*item geſta Sanctorum Martyrum*—So that the beginning and end (that is, four parts in ſix) are Forged by their own Confeſſion; Yea, the whole, as *Binius* grants, *is ſo confuſed, that in many places it is impoſſible to read it*; yet (they ſay) they have ventured to mend it as well as they can. But after all their correcting, or (rather) corrupting it, the Copies do not agree: Some want the Book of *Judith* and the 2*d* of *Macchabees:* Some have only one Book of *Kings*, and one of *Chronicles:* Some reckon but two Books of *Solomon*, ſome three, and others five: Some aſcribe *Wiſdom* and *Eccleſiaſticus* to the Son of *Syrach* (h). And after all, as to the Canon it agrees neither with the Council of *Laodicea*, nor with that of *Carthage*, nor indeed with it ſelf, whatever *Binius* vainly brags (*i*). And is not this a rare Foundation for the Trent Fathers to build their miſtaken Decree upon? As to the reſt of it, That paſſage [—*that the Roman is preferred before all other Churches, not by any Synodal Decrees, but by the Voice of Chriſt, &c.*—] is not only a modern addition (as appears by *Gratian* and *Juſtellus* Manuſcript, which omit it) but it contradicts the 4*th* Epiſtle of *Gelaſius*, which ſaith, *The ſupream power over all is not given to any by the Canons, but to the Apoſtolical Church* (k). The order alſo of the Patriarchal Sees (added ſince the time of *Gratian*) is drawn up contrary to the Canons of *Conſtantinople* and *Chalcedon:* The account of Councils make the Emperors *Conſtantine* and *Theodoſius* Preſidents of the two firſt General Councils, *Marcian* and *Anatolius* of the 4*th*, without naming *Leo*, and only mentions *Celeſtine*'s conſent to the third Council: So that this piece was coyned before the Pope pretended all Councils void wherein he or his Legates did not preſide. And that

(f) *Lab.* marg. col. 1260.

(g) *Gratian.* Decret. par. 1. diſt. 15. c. 3. pag. 20, &c. Et *Lab.* col. 1261.

(h) See *Lab.* col. 1260. in marg. *Geſen's* Hiſt. of the Canon, pag. 123.

(*i*) *Bin.* in not. pag 502. *Lab.* col. 1266.

(k) *Gelaſ.* ep. 4. *Bin.* pag. 471. *Lab.* col. 1170.

that paſſage, *That the Acts of the Martyrs are not read in the Roman Church, becauſe many of them are writ by anonymous, miſtaken, weak and Heretical Authors* (l), was writ before that Church had ſtuffed all her Offices ſo full of lying Legends, and ridiculous Romances about the Saints, the reading of which (before the Reformation) took up a third part of the Prieſts time upon Feſtival days: But upon the whole I dare aver, it is not *Gelaſius* his work, but moſt of it forged by *Iſidore Mercator* 300 Year after the time of this pretended Council: Wherefore it ought not to be cited as evidence on their ſide.

(l) *Bin.p.*501. *Lab.*col.1263.

There is a 2*d* Roman Council under *Gelaſius* to abſolve *Miſenus*, one of the Popes Legates, who had betrayed his Maſter, and now repented: But admit the matter of Fact be true, yet the bad ſtyle, and barbarous phraſe of theſe Acts are ſtrong ſuſpicions of their being Forged.

§. 10. *Anaſtaſius* the 2*d* ſucceeded *Gelaſius*, according to *Marcellinus* Chronicle (an Author of that time) or in the year 498. But *Nauclerus* places his Election (out of ſome other Author) *An.*492 (*m*). *Baronius* and the Editors without Authority correct both theſe, and place his entrance *An.*496 (*n*). The matter is not great, and ſerves only to ſhew us the obſcurity of the Popes in that Age, whoſe Times are ſo differently related in Hiſtory, that we may be ſure they were not made (as now at *Rome*) an *Æra* to reckon Councils and all other Church matters by: The Author of the Pontifical (who writ after the quarrel about *Acacius* was over) ſaith hard things of this Pope; *viz.* 1*ſt*, That his Clergy rejected him, becauſe without any Council he communicated with *Photinus* a Deacon of *Theſſalonica*, a Man of *Acacius* party: And 2*ly*, becauſe he would privately have reſtored *Acacius*: For which alſo (he ſaith) by the Divine Judgment he was ſtruck with death (*o*). Now all this was allowed for truth by their own Writers before *Baronius* (p). And both *Ivo* and *Gratian* received it for Authentic Hiſtory, and placed it in their collecti-

*An.Dom*496.

(m) *Naucler.* Chron.Gen.17. pag.694.

(n) Not.in Vit. *Anaſ.Bin.* pag. 505. *Lab.*col. 1276.

(o) Vit. *Anaſ.*ut ſupra.

(p) *Rolewinc.* faſcic. Temp. fo.53. *Nauclet.*Chron. Gen.17.p.694. *Platin.*vit. *An. Volatteranus, &c.*

ons

ons (q). But ſince the partial Cardinal writ, (not to diſcover truth, but to diſprove all that ſeemed to reflect on) the Roman See, *Gratian* is corrected in later Editions with a Note which contradicts the Text; and the Editors Notes out of *Baronius* (which extol the Pontifical to the Skies when it reports the greateſt falſhoods for the honour of *Rome*) here ſay that Book is erroneous and faulty; yea, they charge them all to be Hereticks that ſpread theſe reports, largely diſputing that all this is falſe: But in vain; For 1*ſt*, as to his allowing the name of *Acacius* to be reſtored in the Dypticks (which is the meaning of *voluit revocare Acacium* in the Pontifical); This is certainly true: For the Emperor *Juſtin* expreſly affirms this Pope did communicate with *Acacius* his party, as the Notes own, and they cannot diſprove it but by falſifying an Epiſtle of Pope *Symmachus*, and reading *ego* for *nego* (as ſhall be ſhewed preſently). Nor is it any wonder that one Pope ſhould approve what his Predeceſſors had condemned; and if this be true, *Anaſtaſius* judged better than former Popes, whoſe Eyes were dazeled ſo by Ambition, that they could not ſee the Truth. 2*ly*, As to his communicating with *Photinus* without a Council, the Notes finally do not deny it; and it ſeems *Fœlix* the Senator doubted not (if *Anaſtaſius* had lived) to have engaged him to ſubſcribe *Zeno*'s Edict for Union; ſo that he was likely enough to be moderate toward *Acacius* his party: Only I do not think he would (as the Notes pretend) venture upon his ſingle Authority to abſolve *Photinus*, if he had been condemned by a Council, becauſe in that Age the Popes did not exerciſe any ſuch power. 3*dly*, As to his being ſtrook with death by voiding his Bowels, it might be true; nor can I think (as the Notes ſuggeſt) that all the Authors above-cited are miſtaken, and put the Pope for the Emperor, who died by Thunder, becauſe the Deaths were very different: And though *Binius* ſay it was *about the ſame time* (r); that is very falſe; for the Pope died *An.* 598, in the Emperor's Seventh Year: But the Emperor lived near twenty year longer, and died not till

(q) *Ivo Carnot.* par. 14. cap. 40. *Gratian* decret. par. 1. diſt. 19. c. 9.

(r) Not. in vit. *Anaſ. Bin.* pag. 506. *Lab.* col. 1278.

till *An.* 517. So that thoſe Hiſtorians muſt be very dull who could not diſtinguiſh two ſuch different things happening to two Perſons at ſo great a diſtance of time and place, but took it for the ſame ſtory: Yet after all it may be this Pope died a natural death, and that this ſlander of his dying by Gods Judgment might be the invention of the next Age, after the Popes had got *Acacius* to be declared a Schiſmatick; for then the Writers were to blacken all his Friends by ſuch Fables as theſe. And now that turn is ſerved, *Baronius* would wipe off the ſtain again, meerly becauſe *Anaſtaſius* was a Biſhop of *Rome*: How probable this gueſs is, I leave the Reader to judge.

There is but one Epiſtle of this Pope, writ to the Emperor (his Name-ſake) *Anaſtaſius*, wherein 'tis plain, he thinks the Quarrel about *Acacius* now deceaſed, no juſt ground for the two Churches to ſeparate from each other (*s*): Yet for the ſcandal he had given, his Opinion was, that his Name alone ought to be left out of the Dypticks; but withal he approves of the Baptiſm and Orders he had given, and juſtifies this by good proofs of Scripture (*t*). *Gratian* holds this laſt Decree to be illegal and uncanonical, becauſe it contradicts the determinations of ſome of his Predeceſſors (*u*). But impartial Readers will ſee, that his Opinion is better confirmed by Reaſon and Scripture, than the contrary ever was by any Pope that held it: Nor ought the Notes to ſay, *Anaſtaſius* decreed this by a diſpenſation grounded on his Apoſtolical Authority For it is an Orthodox Truth, *That the Crimes of the diſpenſers of Sacraments and Holy Orders, eſpecially if it be only Schiſm, do not invalidate them, to ſuch as in their integrity receive them:* So that unleſs a Pope need a diſpenſation to tell Truth, here is no occaſion for any diſpenſing Power.

(*s*) Epiſt. *Anaſt. Bin.* pag. 506. *Lab.* col. 1279.

(*t*) Ibid. *Bin.* 507. *Lab.* col. 1280.

(u) *Gratian.* decret. par. 1. diſt. 19. cap. 7, & 8.

This Epiſtle is followed by a Memorial given by the Legates of *Alexandria* to the Popes Legates then at *Conſtantinople*, for an Union between the two Churches (*w*), which they ſpeak of as equal Siſter Churches, and give

(*w*) Memor. *Bin.* pag. 508. *Lab.* col. 1283.

no hint of any ſubjection due from them to *Rome*, (which they think) had unfortunately miſtaken them, as guilty of Hereſie: Nor doth *Anaſtaſius* in the former Letter to the Emperor pretend to any power that he had over *Alexandria*, but deſires the Emperor by his Wiſdom and Authority to reduce them to the Catholic Faith, calling him *the Vicar appointed by God to preſide in the Earth:* Which the modern Roman Writers think too great a complement to a Lay Prince.

An. Dom. 498. Upon the death of *Anaſtaſius*, the Roman Clergy were divided and choſe two Popes, *Laurentius* and *Symmachus:* But after a warm and long conteſt, both parties agreed to refer it to an Heretical *Gothiſh King*, viz. *Theodoric*, to declare an Infallibly Orthodox Head of the Church (*x*). Who modeſtly referred it to a Synod of Biſhops, and they at laſt confirmed the Election of *Symmachus*. The Notes call this *a Schiſm of the univerſal Church* (y). But it was no more than a Schiſm of that particular Church of *Rome*, and had no influence, that we hear of, upon the whole Catholick Church: Only a Legend cited out of the fabulous Dialogues (which diſparage the Name of *Gregory* the Great) tells us, that *Paſchaſius*, a learned and holy Roman Deacon, was ſeen after his death in an odd Purgatory of hot Water, condemned thither (as *Symmachus* Friends told the ſtory) for taking part with *Laurentius* (z): But it ſeems when this Fable was made, praying to Saints was not in faſhion; for *Paſchaſius* deſires the Biſhop that ſaw him *to pray to the Lord to releaſe him.* The Notes alſo here cite a very idle ſtory of an Image which bled when it was ſhot; but *Damaſcen* is his Author, who lived 250 year after this, and whoſe ſtories about Images are generally ridiculous and incredible. But 'tis more material to obſerve, that this Pope *Symmachus* was charged with notorious Crimes, and the Papal power was then ſo low, that the Roman Clergy petitioned an *Arrian King* to ſend Viſiters to try the Pope, who ſubmitted to this Judicature authorized (ſay the Notes) by this *excellent Prince:* And the Biſhops (as they obſerve) not only acquitted the Pope, but were ſo wiſe

(x) Vit. *Symmac. Bin.* pag. 509. *Lab.* col. 1286.

(y) Not. *Bin.* pag. 510. *Lab.* col. 1288.

(z) Not. ib. *Bin. Lab.* col. 1289.

wiſe as to conceal the fault of which he was accuſed (*a*). But if that were ſo great a piece of Wiſdom, *Ennodius*, who then writ an Apology for him, and *Baronius* and *Binius*, who now would vindicate him, ſhew no great diſcretion in confeſſing he was accuſed of Adultery (*b*): For which, (if it were true,) he deſerved a worſe Purgatory than his Antagoniſt *Paſchaſius*.

(*a*) Not *Bin.* pag. 511. *Lab.* col. 1290.

(*b*) *Ennod.* ap. *Bin.* pag. 528. & *Lab.* col. 1342.

The Epiſtles publiſhed in *Symmachus*'s name are Eleven. The two firſt of which were formerly directed to *Cæſarius*, but now they alter the Title, and inſcribe them to *Eonius*: It ſeems the Forger was no good Chronologer; and the Stile is ſo barbarous, the Senſe ſo obſcure, and the Matter ſo jejune, that it would be a Scandal to any Pope to have writ them (*c*). And if *Symmachus* writ theſe, the *5th* and *8th* may be diſcerned by their Style, to have been endited for him by a more able hand (*d*), that is, by *Ennodius*, who *Binius* ſuppoſes did write the *8th* Epiſtle (*e*). However, this Pope is very free in blaming his Predeceſſor for decreeing contrary to the ancient Cuſtom (*f*): But he ſcruples not to break many Canons at once, by ordering that *the Popes for the future ſhall name their Succeſſors* (g). In the *7th* Epiſtle of *Symmachus*, the Editors and *Baronius* have manifeſtly corrupted the Text, reading *iſta quidem ego*, for *iſta quidem nego* (h): But the Senſe ſhews the Forgery; for the Emperor had charged the Pope for excommunicating him, in the caſe of *Acacius*; *Symmachus* replies, *I deny theſe things; we have not Excommunicated you, O Emperor, but* Acacius: *leave him, and you are quit of his Excommunication; if you do not thruſt your ſelf into his Excommunication you are not Excommunicated by us; if you do, you are Excommunicated by your ſelf, not by us: So that whether you ſtick to him or leave him, however you are not Excommunicated by us.* We ſee the Pope over and over declares, they had not by any particular Sentence Excommunicated the Emperor at *Rome*; it was only *Acacius* in particular, and his Followers in general, who were ſentenced there;

Baron. An. 502. n. 32.

(*c*) *Symmach.* Epiſt. 1, & 2. *Bin.* pag. 511. *Lab* col. 1291.

(*d*) Ep. 5. *Bin.* pag. 512. *Lab.* col. 1295.

(*e*) Ep. 8 *Bin.* pag. 515. *Lab.* col. 1300.

(*f*) *Sym.* Ep. 1. ut ſupra.

(*g*) Concil. 1. Rom. *Bin.* pag. 519.

(h) *Sym.* Ep. 7. *Bin.* pag. 514. *Lab.* col. 1298. *Baron.* An. 505. n. 17.

in which Sentence if the Emperor wilfully involved himſelf, they (who had done nothing againſt him) could not juſtly be blamed, as if they had Excommunicated him: Now to bring in this Sentence with *iſta quidem Ego* ——is to make the Pope contradict himſelf, and confeſs he had Excommunicated the Emperor, which he utterly denies, and therefore *iſta quidem Nego*—— muſt be the true Reading, and that bold Forgery of turning it into [*Ego*,] was made on purpoſe to ſet up an early Precedent for the Pope's having Excommunicated Emperors. Finally, The Margen of the ſame Epiſtle (to carry on the ſame holy Cheat) obſerves, *That the Pope's Dignity is greater than the Emperors:* But this is not in the Text, where *Symmachus* thus expreſſeth himſelf, *I will not ſay, it is a greater, but an equal power:* So that when the Pope had ſtretcht a little, they go much further, and dare tell greater Untruths than he.

And here we ſhall conclude this Century, becauſe the firſt Synod ſaid to be held under this Pope, ought to be dated after the year 500, and belongs to the next Age: To which we ſhall proceed (with Gods aſſiſtance) hereafter, when we have firſt (in our uſual method) noted ſome remarkable Errors in *Baronius*, that are within this Period, but have not fallen in our way, as we treated of the Councils of this time.

An

An Appendix concerning Baronius *his* Annals.

THE Cardinal hath given a juſt, but ſevere cenſure of his own Hiſtory, where he ſaith, *It is dangerous to enquire after Truth among later Writers, who are often found to write that which falſe rumors, vain imagination, private affection and ſometimes Flattery ſuggeſted to their Minds, to the great prejudice of Hiſtorical Truth* (a). Yet he borrows very many of his Relations concerning the Saints, and ancient Practices, from Modern Authors, or from ſpurious Tracts, of which this Period affords us theſe Inſtances.

(a) *Baron. An.* 1077.

§. 1. They will have *Porcarius* the Abbot to have been a Martyr, and celebrate his Martyrdom *Aug.* 12*th*, and yet the Hiſtory is taken out of a ſpurious Tract, and he owns the Matter of Fact to be falſe (*b*). His report of a Golden Saviour (ſo they name an Image) decked with precious Jewels, made by the Emperor *Valentinian*, at the requeſt of Pope *Sixtus*, hath no better Authority than the Epiſtle of Pope *Adrian* to *Charlemain*, which is ſtuffed with Fables: No Writer of this Age takes notice of it, nor were ſuch Images then uſed: So that it need be no wonder, that the Vandals did not plunder this rich Statue, becauſe in the time of their Sacking *Rome* it was not there (*c*). But if ſome worſhiper of Images about *Adrian*'s time, to gain repute to this Golden Statue, aſcribed a greater Antiquity to it, than he ought (as was uſual in ſuch caſes,) *Baronius* doth ill to repreſent it as a Wonder, that an Image was not ſtolen before it was made.

(b) *Baron. An.* 453. n. 47. pag. 191, 192.

(c) *Baron. An.* 455. n. 3. pag. 203.

The

The reſpect that *Childeric*, a Pagan King of *France*, payed to St. *Genovefa*, and the Miracles that occaſioned it, depends on the Credit of *Surius*, and the Acts of that Virgin; ſo that the Matter of fact is very ſuſpicious (*d*); and the large reflexion upon it is as frivolous, in repreſenting a Heathen King as more pious than thoſe (whom he calls) Hereticks, for venerating and worſhiping the Saints; for his Story proves nothing of his worſhiping a Saint departed; and if any living Saints could now be found in their Church, I dare ſay, the very Hereticks would give them great reſpect.

(d) *Baron. An.* 456. n. 7. pag. 212.

That Apparition of the Bleſſed Virgin to *Leo* before he was Emperor, which the Annaliſt deſcribes ſo prolixly, hath no other nor better Author than *Nicephorus*, who lived long after this Age, and is by this very Hiſtorian often cenſured for a fabulous Writer (*e*). Again, to juſtifie an improbable Story of *Cæſarius* while he was but a young Biſhop, imperiouſly commanding a greater and much elder Biſhop than himſelf, (*Eucherius* Biſhop of *Lyons*) to work a Miracle, taken out of a corrupted piece of *Cæſarius* his Life; He rejects the Chronology of *Gennadius*, and talks of ſuppoſing two Biſhops of *Lyons*, named both of them *Eucherius* (d), though no ancient Author mention any ſuch thing.

(e) *Baron. An.* 457. n. 4. pag. 218.

(d) *Baron. An.* 463. n. 6. 258.

The Relation of an Angels viſibly waiting on St. *Marcellus*, when he and his Monks went to Petition the Emperor againſt the making an Arrian, *Cæſar*; is cunningly contrived: For the Author notes, that of all the company, *only ſome few witneſſes fore-ordained of God, who had clearer Eyes than the reſt, ſaw this Angel* (e). And *Zonaras* (a more credible Writer than the Deviſer of theſe Acts,) who mentions the Story, never heard of this Apparition at all (*f*). However, if theſe few ſharp-ſighted Gentlemen deſigned to impoſe upon the reſt of the Monks, the Plot was well laid, that none but they ſhould diſcern the Angel.

(e) *Baron. An.* 469. n. 4, 5. pag. 283.

(f) *Zonar.* Annal. Tom. 3.

The

The Miracle of the Beam of Light, appearing at the Election of St. *Remigius*, the Apoſtle of the French, is very ſuſpicious, becauſe *Sidonius* who knew and admired him, and lived at the ſame time, is ſilent; and the report is fetched from a Succeſſor of his, who writ (or is pretended to have writ) this above 300 year after (*g*).

(g) *Baron. An.* 471. n. 36. pag. 293.

Though *Surius* be one of his moſt common Authors for all his Legends, yet he confeſſes *great defects, and many things which need correction, are found in his Collection* (h); and he in the ſame Page taxes *Nicephorus* to be Erroneous (*i*), yet hath no better Authors than he and *Metaphraſtes*, for *the invention of the moſt Holy Garment of the Bleſſed Virgin*, which yet no doubt the ignorant People of the Roman Communion do mightily adore (*k*): Such another Evidence, is the *Pratum Spirituale* of *Jo. Moſchus* (falſly aſcribed to *Sophronius*;) yet out of this, he Records a very Scandalous Story; that the Bleſſed Virgin declared to a devout Votareſs of hers, whom *Zeno* had abuſed by violence; That ſhe could not take vengeance on him for his Luſt, becauſe this Emperor gave much Alms (*l*); which teaches Rich Men how to continue as filthy as they pleaſe, and be ſecured againſt the Divine Vengeance, if any be ſo weak as to credit it.

(h) *Baron. An.* 473. n. 4. p. 299.
(*i*) Ibid. n. 10. p. 301.
(*k*) Id. An. 474. n. 4. pag. 301.
(*l*) *Baron.* eod. An. n. 10. p. 303.

It ſhews great partiality for any Story about the Relicks of the Saints, in that *Baronius* rejects all the circumſtances mentioned by *Theodorus Lector* about the Relicks of St. *Euſtatius*, and yet will have us believe the ſolemn removal of them to *Antioch*; whereas we have reaſon to reſpect the Story it ſelf to be falſe, when the ſole Author was groſly miſtaken, both in the time and effects of tranſlating the Relicks (*m*). But the buſineſs of the Annaliſt was, to defend and allow every thing that ſeemed to make the veneration of Relicks ancient.

(m) *Baron. An.* 482. n. 4 & 5. pag. 355.

Nothing is more evident in this Age, than that the Emperors or the Gothiſh Kings; yea, the Præfects of *Rome* made Rules for the Election of the Popes, and either

either confirmed or annulled them: But whereas there is a Decree about Elections at *Rome*, made in the vacancy of the See, by the Roman Clergy and *Basilius* the Præfect, which seems to be very genuine (*n*); *Baronius* rejects it, by the bare Authority of a Synod that hath been forged, (as shall be shewed) on purpose to persuade the World, that Princes had nothing to do in the Election of Popes.

(n) *Baron. An.* 483. n. 10, &c. pag. 371.

The Story of the Apparition of St. *Michael* at Mount *Garganus*, is cited only out of a late Author, *viz. Sigebert*, who lived above 600 year after this time: And therefore the Cardinal ought not to have been so nice, in mending a gross mistake in the Relation, (which shews the ignorance of the Inventor of this Fable, (but rather to have rejected the whole Fiction so absurdly related, and so ill attested (*o*).

(n) *Baron. An.* 493. n. 43. pag. 480.

With like industry *Baronius* defends two most ridiculous Fables about Images, which *Jo. Damascen* cites out of *Theodoret*'s Ecclesiastical History, and yet the Facts happened (as is pretended in the Reign of *Anastasius*,) who was not Emperor till 30 year after *Theodoret*'s death (*p*). Now rather than lose such Evidence for the Veneration of Images, the Annalist falls to guessing, who was the true Author of these Fables; and first he thinks it was *Theodorus Lector*; but he writ in *Anastasius* his time, who ordered this Picture to be made, so that he could not speak of this, as an old Piece spoiled with moisture: Wherefore at last he finds another *Theodoret*, besides the famous Bishop of *Cyrus*, but knows neither where nor when he lived: So that such an obscure Writer is not a sufficient Witness to make great improbabilities credible; yet he takes this for *a mighty and clear Miracle*, *wrought by God at* Constantinople *in the East*, *on purpose to confute the Arrian Princes then Reigning in* Africa, Italy *and* Gaul (*q*); Who in all probability never heard of this Story, and would much sooner have believed it, if it had been done in their own Country.

(p) *Baron. An.* 494. n. 59. pag. 494.

(q) Id. ibid. n. 66, &c. pag. 396.

It

It is very improbable, that later Authors ſhould know ſo exactly all the little Acts, Sayings and Miracles of St. *Benedict*, and yet differ almoſt 30 year about the year of his Birth; nor are they agreed about his Age and Death. This minds me of a Comical Authors remark upon ſuch as pretend to Pray and Preach Extempore by an Hour-glaſs—*As if the Spirit could teach them what to ſay*; but *not how much*—— It is (doubtleſs) a ſtrong ſuſpicion that moſt of the Relations were invented after the time of this Saint, (little noted in his own days) was forgotten. Yet I ſee not how the time of writing *the Dialogues* (called) *Gregory's*, ſhould prove *Marianus*, *Scotus*, *Sigebert* and *Trithemius* miſtaken, in ſaying *Benedict* was born in the year 507: Becauſe if *Gregory* the ſecond (which is very probable,) were the Author of thoſe fabulous Dialogues, he was made Pope *An.* 714. (in an Age of Legends,) and ſo *Benedict* dying, *An.* 603. might have four Abbots his Succeſſors, before this heap of Fables was put together, which are very unworthy of *Gregory* the 1*ſt* Pope (*r*). It is worth noting, that this Benedict *deſpiſed Learning and Study, and ran away from School* (s); an ill Omen, that his followers the Monks ſhould help to ruin all *polite literature*, and bring in that ignorance which covered all Chriſtendom for many Ages: For what other could be expected from ſuch a Founder, that was *knowingly ignorant, and wiſely unlearned* (as this *Gregory* ſpeaks?) But it was not only his Caſe; for St. *Francis*, another Founder of Monkery, bids his Followers——*if they cannot Read, never to learn any Letters, but above all to take heed they may be inſpired with the Spirit* (t): Yea, he makes *reading much, and getting Books, to be one of his bad ſigns* (u). Theſe illiterate Patrons were fit to lead on an Army of Ignoramus Fryers, to extinguiſh the Light of Learning, that their falſe Doctrins and cheating Practices might paſs undiſcovered in the darkneſs they had made.

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 494. n. 70. pag. 497.
(*s*) Id. ib. n. 73.
(*t*) Regula S. *Fran.* cap. 8. pag. 28.
(*u*) Idem ibid. pag. 91.

Further, we may obſerve, that the Cardinal ſeverely Taxes *Trithemius*, and other Monkiſh Writers, for

falſly feigning that many Eminent Men, who preceded *Benedict* in time, were Monks of his Order, out of a blind Zeal to ſet up its glory (*w*). But he conſiders not, that the ſame blind Zeal hath put theſe Authors, (out of whom he brings innumerable Stories,) upon ſaying very falſe things for the glory of their Order, which probably never were done upon the face of the Earth. So that he ſhould have better Authority than theſe partial Monks, for the Miracles of their own Saints.

(w) *Baron.* ibid. n. 78. pag. 498.

Theodorus Lector heaped up many ſcattered Reports without care, and is not of the beſt credit, eſpecially in caſe of Relicks; but his ſingle Teſtimony is enough, to make *Baronius* believe, *That God takes care of a dead Saints Bones*, in an Earthquake, which probably might ſwallow up many living Saints (*x*), who often ſuffer in ſuch Common Calamities.

(x) *Baron. An.* 499. n. 13. pag. 531.

Thoſe Miracles of St. *Remigius*, which are impiouſly equalled to them that the Apoſtles wrought (*y*), have no better evidence than two Authors, (*Aimonius* and *Hincmarus*,) who writ about 400 year after: For that Epiſtle of *Hormiſda*, wherein that Pope makes *Remigius* his Legate, is (like the reſt of that kind,) a manifeſt Forgery: For he mentions *Clovis*, the modern name of *Ludovicus*, as if he were the King of *France*, and newly Baptized; whereas *Clovis* died at leaſt four year before *Hormiſda* was Pope, and was Baptized near twenty year before this Letter is pretended to be writ. From which Examples, (though but few) it appears *Baronius* his evidence for Miracles, and other things that tend to ſupport the Superſtitions of *Rome*, are generally forged, or ſuſpicious Authors.

(y) *Baron. An.* 499. n. 27, 28, 29. pag. 534, 535.

§. 2. But when he cites genuine Writers in ſuch Points, he often corrupts their Senſe, and ſometimes their Words: For inſtance, *Baronius* pretends, that an intire Edict of *Marcian*'s is imperfect, meerly becauſe he cannot find in it any particular expreſſions, to take away the Primacy of the See of *Conſtantinople* (z). Whereas

(z) *Baron. An.* 454. n. 12, & 13. pag. 197.

Whereas this Edict clearly confirms the Canon of *Chalcedon*, which had given the second place to *Conſtantinople*, by this very Emperor *Marcian*'s conſent: And it is ſomething odd, that our Annaliſt by meer fancy, ſhould aſſert even with confidence, than an Emperor of the Eaſt ſhould revoke by an Edict, and a Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* renounce a Priviledge granted by that ſame Emperor, and in a General Council, to that Church, a few years before.

Again, He inſinuates that St. *Severine* allowed the Worſhip of Saints departed, now uſed in the Roman Church (*a*): But the Authors he cites, *Euagrius* and *Eugippius*, though they writ many years after St. *Severine*'s death,) have not one word of any deliverance by the praying to Saints: But one of them ſaith, *they were freed from the Famin by the Providence of God:* And the other affirms, *they praiſed God for hearing St.* Severine's *Prayers in this Calamity:* So that *Severine* prayed only to God, and the People of that Age praiſed him alone: And how can this excite the Poſterity of that Nation at this day to pray to St. *Severine* ſo long after his deceaſe? (a) *Baron. An.* 454. n. 29. pag. 202.

What *Victor* ſaith of thoſe, who ſuffered death by the Arrian Perſecution in *Africa*, *That the Romans would count them Martyrs* (b), muſt be meant either of the Roman Captives in *Africk*, or of the Roman Church in *Italy*, who looked on theſe Sufferers as their Brethren, and of the ſame Faith, and ſo reckoned them Martyrs: But to ſtretch this Phraſe, to ſignifie, that then the words [*Roman*] and [*Catholick*] were of the ſame import, is very unreaſonable, and what *Victor* never dreamed of. (b) *Baron. An.* 456. n. 23. pag. 215.

'Tis very ſuſpicious, that *Ecdicius* did not get his wonderful Victory over the *Goths* by praying to St. *Martin*, becauſe that Hiſtory is related by two Authors, one very Authentick, that is, *Sidonius*, who might have been, and probably was an Eye-witneſs, who doth not once name St. *Martin:* The other *Gregory* of *Tours*, that lived near 150 years after, and he mentions it indeed, as done *by the invocation of the*

Saint of his Church (c). But *Baronius* in the next year taxes him with writing things *that could not be credited* (d). Wherefore, he ſhould rather have drawn his concluſion from the living and certain Hiſtorian, if Truth had been the buſineſs of theſe Annals.

(c) *Baron. An.* 466. n. 10, 11, 12. pag. 271, 272.

(d) Id. *An.* 467. p. 11. pag. 275.

The Emperor *Leo*'s Edict, is ſolely deſigned for the keeping holy the Lords-days, which are the Feſtivals, properly dedicated to the Majeſty of the Moſt High. But the Annaliſt expounds this of all Feaſt-days (*e*), to give more colour to the ſcandalous uſage of their Church, where more reverence is given to a little Saints-day, than to the Sunday, which from the Creation, or however, from the Apoſtles times, was moſt religiouſly kept to the Honour of God himſelf, as the principal time of his moſt ſolemn Worſhip.

(e) *Baron. An.* 469 n. 6, 7. pag. 284.

Baronius alſo wrongs *Zeno* the Emperor, in ſaying, *that his Edict for Union did Anathematize the Council of* Chalcedon (*f*): For the words of the Edict ſhew the contrary, ſince *Zeno* only Anathematizes them, who believed not according to the Nicene Creed, whether in the Council of *Chalcedon*, or in any other Council; and the Cardinal himſelf in the next page, only charges *Zeno*, *with tacitly abrogating the Council of* Chalcedon (*g*); and *Liberatus* affirms, the Emperor was angry with *John Talaia*, *for not reliſhing the Council of* Chalcedon (*h*): Yea, the Zealots againſt this General Council, at *Alexandria*, renounced the Communion of *Peter*; becauſe by ſubſcribing this Edict of Union, he had refuſed openly to Anathematize the Council of *Chalcedon* (i); all which ſhews, that this Edict did not condemn that Council.

(f) *Baron. An.* 482. n 30. pag. 361.

(g) Id ib. n. 35.

(h) Ibid. n. 36.

(i) Id. ib. n. 43. pag. 364.

Liberatus ſaith no more, but *that the Papers were taken away, leſt they ſhould be delivered to the Catholicks, to whom they were written*: But *Baronius* out of this affirms, That the Pope writ *to the Clergy, the Monks and Orthodox Laity* (k), (as if he had ſeen the Titles of the ſeveral Letters,) and cites *Liberatus* for his Evidence.

(k) *Baron. An.* 483. n. 49. pag. 381.

In

In like manner he brings in the words of *Liberatus*, after a Fictitious Letter of a Roman Synod: And cites him thus, Theſe Letters being given to *Acacius*, he would not receive them, &c. (*l*). By which one would imagine, that *Liberatus* had atteſted this feigned Synodical Letter; but this Author ſpeaks only of that Epiſtle of *Fœlix*, which *Baronius* had cited three pages before (*m*), and knew nothing of any Synodical Epiſtle.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 484. n. 34. pag. 397.

(m) Id. ib. pag. 394. n. 17.

Thus he cites part of an Oration made at the dedication of a Church, which had been an Idols Temple, but now was conſecrated to the memory of Chriſt, and of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; and though there be not one Syllable in the words cited of any worſhip of Saints, yet *Baronius* concludes, *that this is enough to intimate, that the worſhip of the Saints did always flouriſh, not only among the Biſhops of this new dedicated Church, but among all Catholicks* (n): But he muſt be very willing to believe a falſe Doctrin, that will receive it from a bold Concluſion, that hath no Premiſſes.

(n) *Baron. An.* 489. n. 15. pag. 440.

Again, To give credit to a Relation of St. *Michael's* appearing and being worſhiped at *Rome* in this Age, he cites a Poet, who ſays nothing of the worſhip of St. *Michael*; and he would alſo inſinuate, that this *Drepanius* lived about this time (*o*), to make this Superſtition ſeem more ancient: Whereas it is well known, that *Drepanius Florus* writ about the year 650, that is, 150 year after this Age, and 50 year after Pope *Gregory* (p), at which time many Corruptions and groſs Ignorance were viſible in the Church.

(o) *Baron. An.* 493. n. 45. pag. 480.

(p) Vid. *Cave* Tabul. Eccleſ. pag. 132. & *Du Pin.* Sect. 7. pag. 39.

We may alſo note, That *Baronius* corrects *Marcellinus's* Chronicle, about the ingreſs of Pope *Anaſtaſius*, out of the Pontifical; whereas *Marcellinus* lived at that time, and brought down his Chronicle to the year 534, and ſo is a very credible Author (*q*). But in the ſame page our Annaliſt ſhews, how groſly the Pontifical is miſtaken in point of time, ſpeaking of things as done under one Pope, that were done under another; and affirming ſuch and ſuch Facts done to Perſons, that were dead.

(q) *Baron. An.* 496. n. 55. pag. 518.

(r) Id. ibid. n. 23. dead long before (r): Yet not only here, but in many places this miſtaken Author is the ſole Standard of *Baronius* his Chronology. And whereas *Theodorus Lector*, (who writ *An.* 518.) expreſly ſaith, King *Theodorick* called a Synod at *Rome* (s): The Cardinal rejects his Teſtimony, and out of the Pontifical and ſome ſpurious Acts, affirms, *that Pope* Symmachus *called this Synod* (t): For thoſe are the beſt Authors that ſpeak of their ſide.

(s) *Theod. Lector.* collect. l. 2. pag. 186.

(t) *Baron. An.* 499. n. 1. p. 592.

§. 3. With like artifice our Author conceals ſome part of the Truth, which might prejudice his Cauſe: As for inſtance, he notes as a peculiar piece of impudence and madneſs in *Timothy Ælurus*, the Invader of the See of *Alexandria*, *that he darted forth his Anathema's againſt the Roman Biſhops*, and makes a diſmal repreſentation of that Crime (*u*): But the Epiſtle which relates the Story, ſaith, he Anathematized *Anatolius* Archbiſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and *Baſilius* of *Antioch*, as well as *Leo* Biſhop of *Rome* (w): So that there is no reaſon to conceal that in his Recapitulation, but only to make the Pope look higher, and greater than he was in thoſe days.

(u) *Baron. An.* 457. n. 28. pag. 224.

(w) Ibid. n 25. pag. 223.

Liberatus (no doubt) was better informed what paſſed at *Alexandria*, than *Leo* could be at *Rome*; ſo that his account that *Timothy Ælurus* was immediately ſent into Baniſhment by the Emperor from *Alexandria*, is far more credible, than that which *Baronius* deduces from Pope *Leo*'s Letters, of his coming firſt to *Conſtantinople*: But the Cardinal corrects *Liberatus* by Conjectures, meerly to perſuade the World, that the Emperor obeyed the Pope (*x*) in Baniſhing that Heretick; whereas the Writers of that time ſay, he did it by advice of a Synod at *Conſtantinople*.

(x) *Baron. An.* 460. n. 3, & 8. pag. 246, 247.

It is alſo obſervable, that when he ſpeaks of Epiſtles writ, or Meſſages ſent to the Biſhop of *Rome* by any new Patriarch, he always adds, *de more*, *according to Cuſtom* (y); But though it was as much *according to Cuſtom*, for every new Patriarch to write to the Biſhop

(y) *Baron. An.* 482. n. 1. pag. 355.

ſhop of *Conſtantinople*, or to him of *Antioch*, *&c.* to notifie his Election, and declare his being in the Communion of the Catholick Church (z); Yet there *Baronius* leaves out thoſe words, *according to Cuſtom.*

(z) Id. ib. n. 23, 24. pag. 359, 360.

§. 4. But there are more Inſtances of his obſcuring the Truth by falſe reaſoning, and particularly by ſuppoſing things as certain, which are not proved, and then making Inferences from thence, and offering ſuch Concluſions for manifeſt Truths. Thus upon Suppoſition that the Pope was then above the Emperor, and that nothing relating to the Church could be done without the Roman Biſhop; He introduces an Edict of *Marcian's*, with a Letter of Pope *Leo's*, and with this Phraſe, *The Emperor* Marcian *obeyed Pope Leo* (a). Whereas that Letter of *Leo* hath no relation to the Edict, and is an humble Petition to the Emperor to get his Letter to *Flavian* well tranſlated into Greek, and ſent to *Alexandria*, to clear him from an imputation of Hereſie falſly laid to his charge: But the Edict takes no notice of *Leo*, or his Epiſtle, or of the Roman Church, but charges the Alexandrians to follow the Nicene Faith, as it was profeſſed by their own Biſhops, *Athanaſius*, *Theophilus* and *Cyril* (b): And though there be a miſtake in the Month, the Year is right, and it is dated three years after *Leo's* Epiſtle to *Marcian* (c): But the Cardinal alters the date, and would add to the Senſe, only to ſupport his miſtaken Suppoſition.

(a) *Baron. An.* 454. n. 4, 5, 6.

(b) *Baron. An.* 454. n. 7. pag. 196.

(c) Cod. *Juſt.* lib. 1. tit. 5. l. 8. pag 33.

Anatolius, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, might perhaps regulate ſome of the Officers or Clergy of his Church, at the requeſt of Pope *Leo*; but it doth not appear, that either *Leo* did pretend to command *Anatolius*, nor that *Anatolius* owned he had any Authority over him: And it is certain, that for all *Leo's* huffing, the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* did keep the place and priviledges granted by the Council of *Chalcedon*: So that the Cardinals Inferences grounded on ſuppoſing, that

Leo

Leo exerciſed juriſdiction over, and took away the Priviledges from *Anatolius* (d), are not only weak, but very abſurd.

(d) *Baron. An.* 454. n. 14, 15. pag. 198.

He ſuppoſes *Acacius* was the Enditer of an Edict of *Leo* the Emperor, touching the Priviledges of the See of *Conſtantinople*, and then harangues upon his Ambition, and ſeverely taxeth his Pride (*e*). But he brings no proof but his own conjecture, that *Acacius* did procure this Edict: Yet if he did, it only confirms the ancient Priviledges of that See, and thoſe it was then in poſſeſſion of; and if this make him appear proud as *Lucifer* (as the Cardinal intimates:) How many Edicts with ten times loftier Stiles have the Popes procured or forged, to ſet up and ſupport their Supremacy? Yet we find no cenſures of them, nor no inferences, but in their commendation.

(e) *Baron. An.* 472. n. 3, & 4. pag. 294.

It is a falſe ſuppoſition, that *Acacius* was ſtirred up by the Letters of Pope *Simplicius*, to oppoſe the Heretical attempts of the Uſurper *Baſiliſcus*: For (as we have proved before,) *Simplicius* flattered this Tyrant, at the ſame time when *Acacius* moved by his own Zeal for the Catholick Faith, oppoſed him (*f*). But it is the Cardinals deſign, to make all good Deeds owe their original only to the Popes, and to blacken all that *Acacius* did, becauſe he would not truckle to the Papal Chair: Otherwiſe, when *Baſiliſcus* doth no more but reſtore the Rights that *Conſtantinople* had before his time, (as the words of the Edict ſhew (*g*)); and *Theodorus Lector* affirms nothing, but that the Rights of that See were reſtored; why ſhould it be a Crime in *Acacius* to procure this Confirmation from *Baſiliſcus*? I dare ſay, *Baronius* thinks it no fault in *Boniface*, to get the Primacy of *Rome* eſtabliſhed by *Phocas*, a Bloodier Tyrant and greater Uſurper than *Baſiliſcus*.

(f) *Baron. An.* 476. n. 46. pag. 326.

(g) Id. ibid. n. 64.

A little after, upon the bare Affirmation of an intereſted and partial Pope, he ſaith, Acacius *governed the Eaſtern Provinces by a power delegated from the Pope* (h); and upon this ſuppoſition he explains the

(h) *Baron. An.* 477. n. 13. pag. 334.

laſped

lapſed Aſian Biſhops Supplication to him, as if it was on the account of his being the Popes Legate: But nothing can be falſer; for if *Acacius* would have ſubmitted to ſuch a Delagation, the Popes and he had never fallen out; ſo that nothing is more certain, than that he ever deſpiſed ſuch a delegated power, and exerciſed juriſdiction over thoſe Aſian Biſhops by an Authority granted him by Councils and Imperial reſcripts, That is, by as good right as the Pope had in *Italy*.

Another falſe ſuppoſition is, that *Timothy* the Orthodox Biſhop of *Alexandria*, ſent the Petition of ſuch as had fallen in the time of his heretical Predeceſſors, to *Rome* to beg Pardon, and to deſire they might be readmitted into the Church; and thence he infers, *That the abſolution from the crime of Hereſie, was wont to be reſerved to the Pope* (*i*). A Note ſo falſe and abſurd, that we muſt ſuppoſe thoſe Millions of Hereticks, which on their repentance were abſolved all the World over, in all Ages, without conſulting the Pope; were not rightly abſolved, if this were True: But he builds it on a Rotten Foundation; The Letter of *Simplicius*, (whence he deduces it) ſaying no more, but that this *Timothy* of *Alexandria* had ſent him a Copy of this Petition, to ſhew upon what terms he had readmitted them to the Communion of the Church; and the Pope thought his proceedings were unexceptionable: But there is not a word of their deſiring a Pardon from *Rome*, or of the Popes granting it; much leſs of that Patriarchal Church of *Alexandria's* wanting power to reconcile its own Members; which was ſetled on it by the Council of *Nice*, as amply as the Roman Churches was.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 478. n. 15, 16. pag. 342.

Soon after he ſuppoſes, no Election of a Patriarch of *Alexandria* or *Antioch* was good and valid, unleſs it were confirmed by the Pope: Now he draws this conſequence from a Letter of *Simplicius*, which only ſays, *that upon* Zeno *the Emperors charging* John Talaia *the elect Biſhop of* Alexandria *with Perjury*, (who had

endeavoured to get the Pope to own his Communion) *Simplicius* would not confirm him, upon ſo eminent a Perſons objection (*k*). Which confirming, ſignifies no more than the Popes giving him Communicatory Letters as to an Orthodox Biſhop; which was requiſite for every Patriarch to grant to any New-Elected Patriarch as well as the Pope: And that it ſignifies no more is plain from hence, becauſe though afterwards this *John*'s election was approved at *Rome*; yet that confirmation did not make him Biſhop of *Alexandria*: So that a Papal confirmation in thoſe days gave no Biſhop a Title, and was no more but a Teſtimonial of their Communicating with him at *Rome*, and judging him Orthodox: And *John Talaia* deſired ſuch a Confirmation as this from *Acacius* as well as from the Pope, as *Liberatus* affirms (*l*); and the miſcarriage of thoſe Letters, it ſeems was one reaſon why *Acacius* oppoſed his Election.

(*k*) *Baran An.* 482. n. 15. pag. 356.

(*l*) Id. ibid. n. 23. pag. 359.

He reckons up a great many things (in his opinion) grievous Crimes done by *Zeno* the Emperor, *but that* (ſaith he) *which is more odious than all the monſtrous wickedneſſes is, that an Emperor ſhould eſtabliſh a Decree about matters of Faith* (*m*). Now this is all on ſuppoſition, that Princes are not to meddle in the ſetling the True Religion: But if he look into Sacred or Eccleſiaſtical Story, he ſhall find nothing hath been more uſual, than for the moſt Religious Princes to confirm the true, and condemn falſe Religions; and therefore if this *Uniting Edict of Zeno were Orthodox* (*of which we do not now diſpute*) *the making it was no Crime at all.*

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 482. n. 25. pag. 360.

The next Year, he repeats the Story of *John Talaia* his appealing to the Pope; and becauſe in this Age they have made him the Supreme Judge over the whole Church, *Baronius* ſaith *he appealed to him as to the lawful Judge* (*n*). But *Liberatus*, out of whom he hath the Story, ſhews he applyed to the Pope only as an Interceſſor, and perſuaded him to write to *Acacius* in his behalf: And indeed the Popes definitive Sentence in thoſe days, would have done him no good: Wherefore, he

(*n*) *Baron An.* 483. n. 3 pag. 369.

he only desired he would use his interest in *Acacius*, to reconcile him to the Emperor; but all in vain: Which shews that the Eastern Church did not then believe the Pope was a lawful Judge in this Case. It is a bold stroke, under such a Pope as *Simplicius* (who submitted to the Eastern Emperors, who (in *Baronius* Opinion) were Schismaticks, and to the Arrian Gothic Kings in *Italy*, and who could purge his own City from Heresie, but connived at the Arrians who possessed neer half *Rome*); for the Historian to brag, *that the Popes Majesty and Authority shined as bright as under* Constantine, *or* Theodosius (*o*); and as vain a boast, that their Universal Power was as great under Pagan persecuting Emperors as at any other time: For he never hath nor never can make this out; and the History of all Ages shews that the Popes power was very inconsiderable at first, and grew up by degrees; being larger or narrower in old times, as it happened to be favoured or opposed by Kings and Emperors: But it was never very great, till the Popes had ruined both Empires of the East and West.

(*o*) *Baron An.* 483. n. 7. pag. 370, 371.

From this immoderate conceit of the Papal Authority in that Age, proceeds that mistaken observation, That Pope *Felix* and *Gelasius* rejecting the Books of *Faustus Rhegiensis*, was *more than all the pious and learned Writings of S.* Cæsarius, *S.* Avitus *and the famous* Fulgentius, *who in peculiar Tracts confuted* Faustus (*p*): They must be very good blind Catholicks doubtless, who reject an Opinion rather upon the bare Authority of the Pope, than upon the solid Aurguments from Scripture, Reason and Antiquity, urged by the most famous Orthodox Writers.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 490. n. 33. pag. 449.

Baronius taking it for granted, that *to be a Catholic and to be in Communion with the Roman Church is one and the same thing*; wonders that the Orthodox in the East should communicate with *Euphemius* the Orthodox Bishop of *Constantinople*, and main defender of the Council of *Chalcedon*, who did not communicate with the Bishop of *Rome*: And hence he supposes the Eastern

Catholicks were in the dark, and could not distinguish Friends from Foes (*q*). Whereas, it is the Annalists prejudices that put him into this Mist: The Catholicks of the East cleerly saw their great Patriarch was truly Orthodox, and knew no such Principle as the Cardinal dreams of: Wherefore they did not think an Orthodox Bishop less Orthodox, because *Rome* rejected him for not submitting to their Usurpations. So that this instance utterly confutes his Supposition, and shews how unjustly he calls us and others Hereticks, meerly for not submitting to the Popes Supremacy, though we hold the Articles of the Catholic Faith in all other Points.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 492. n. 46. pag. 476.

Of this we have a further proof in the next Year, when *Elias* Bishop of *Jerusalem* (owned by *Baronius* for a good Catholick (*r*), while the Quarrel continued between the Bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople* (which that Author Taxes as a Schism upon both sides) This *Elias* communicated only with *Euphemius*, and is highly commended for so doing; since *Euphemius* was a sound Catholic, and defended the Council of *Chalcedon* (*s*). *Baronius* indeed pretends *Euphemius* was not yet condemned by *Gelasius* (*t*); but his Predecessor had condemned *Acacius* and all that were his partakers, and *Gelasius* was hotter in this Quarrel than *Felix*; which *Elias* of *Hierusalem* knew, and yet took the contrary side to the Popes, as the safer for a good Catholic: Therefore it could not be the opinion of that Age, that holding Communion with *Rome*, was necessary to denominate a man a good Catholick, or to free him from the guilt of Schism.

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 512. pag. 610.

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 493. n. 41. pag. 479.

(*t*) Id. Ibid. n. 42. pag. 480.

To conclude these examples, Who can value all those Pompous Consequences which he draws about the Popes Supremacy, Appeals, *&c.* from the vain brags of an Ambitious Bishop of *Rome* (*u*), which were despised by those to whom he sent them, and ought not to be regarded by us, who know his partiality, and consider he speaks in his own cause (*w*)? But we may note, this is the best evidence they have; and therefore they must make as much of it as they can. Our Lord Jesus did not desire *to bear witness to himself* (*x*); But his pretended

(*u*) *Baron An.* 495. n. 2. &c. pag. 500.

(*w*) Nemo sibi & professor & testis est. *Tertul.* adver. *Marc.* l. 5. cap. 1.

(*x*) *John* v. 31.

tended Vicar, (knowing the weakneſs of his claim) moſt unjuſtly Decrees; *That when the Priviledges of the Apoſtolick See are in queſtion*, he will not have any Judge of them but himſelf (*y*). And if he be Party, Witneſs and Judge, we may gueſs which way the Cauſe will go.

(*y*) Decret. *Innocent.* 3. ap. Decretal. lib. 2. Tit. 1. cap. 12.

§. 5. In the next place we will note ſome of thoſe abſurdities and contradictions, wherein his Zeal to ſerve a party hath intangled this learned Hiſtorian: For Example;

The Cardinal brings in *Leo* oppoſing the advancement of *Jeruſalem* to a Patriarchate, and taxes *Juvenalis* the Biſhop there, *for arrogating this Primacy to himſelf* (*z*); Forgetting that he himſelf had declared, that the Council of *Chalcedon* had ſetled this Primacy upon him (*a*). As for what he produces out of *Leo*, that *Cyril* writ to him againſt this, and with earneſt Prayers deſired him to oppoſe it; either *Leo* feigns this Story, or the Epiſtle is ſuſpicious; ſince it is very unlikely that ſo great a Biſhop as St. *Cyril*, ſhould write ſo humbly, as to beg a favour of *Leo* then but Arch-deacon of *Rome* (*b*). But *Leo* did not like *Juvenalis* his advancement, and therefore *Baronius* muſt condemn it, though granted in a general Council: And though he ſay here, Juvenalis *had nothing of a good Biſhop in him, and ſought the Primacy by evil arts and forged writings, contrary to the Nicene Council*: Yet ſoon after he tells, that *Simeon Stylites* and the devout *Euthymius*, (the grateſt Saints of that Age) gave *Juvenalis* a good Character, and charged the Empreſs *Eudocia*, to communicate with him (*c*). I confeſs, I cannot eaſily underſtand how any Man can more evidently blow hot and cold, as occaſion ſerves, than *Baronius* doth in theſe different Characters of the ſame Biſhop.

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 454. n. 19. pag. 199.
(*a*) Idem. *An.* 451. n. 124. pag. 154. Et *Bin.* Notis in Concil. Chalced. Seſſ. 8. pag 414.
(*b*) Id. ibid. n. 20, & 21 pag. 199, &200.
(*c*) *Baron. An.* 455. n. 19. pag. 207, 208.

He relates three wonderful, if not incredible Stories of St. *Leo*, and the laſt, though juſtified by an ancient Picture, (which is proof enough ſometimes for a ſerviceable Miracle), he utterly rejects as a Fable; The reaſon of which is, that the two former inſtances tended to the Popes credit, but this laſt reflected ſomething on

on his Memory: Otherwiſe we ſhould have had ſome Author or other to atteſt it, at leaſt as good as *Sophronius* (*d*): But this poor Fable wants a Father, and is ſaid to be *unworthy of Chriſtian Ears, and to want all ancient Authority.*

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 461. n. 7. pag. 252.

It is obſervable, that thoſe which he calls *the moſt faithful Acts of* Daniel Stylites (and would have this Saint paſs for a Prophet) relate, that after a great Fire was begun in the City of *Conſtantinople*, and other endeavours to quench it proved vain, they went to *Daniel* to pray for them, who foretold them, that *the Fire ſhould ceaſe after ſeven days*, and ſo it came to paſs (*e*): Yet *Euagrius* a more credible Author ſaith, *The Fire endured but four days, and ſome ſay ſix* (*f*): But his Faithful Acts will have it burn ſeven days after the Citizens came to *Daniel*. We may note alſo, That theſe Legends aſcribe the ſaving the whole City, one to *Daniel's*, another to St. *Mercellus* his Prayers, a third brings in St. *Marcian's* Prayers, as the means of preſerving one Church (*g*): And *Baronius* calls all theſe, *conſentientia dicta*, agreeing Reports: But an impartial Hiſtorian would have diſcerned the difference, and rejected them all as Fictions (*h*): For Truth is one, but Fables have infinite varieties.

(*e*) *Baron. An.* 465. n. 3. pag. 261.

(*f*) Id. ib. n. 5. pag. 262.

(*g*) Id. ibid. n. 8. pag. 263.

(*h*) Hæc eſt enim mendacium natura, ut cohærere non poſſint. *Lact.* lib. 5. §. 3.

He makes a ſevere reflexion upon the Emperor *Leo*, for making an Eutychian Heretick his Admiral, and imputes the loſs of the Fleet to that ſinful choice, and his tolerating of Hereticks (*i*). But unleſs he could prove all Tolerating Princes were conquered, and all Heretical Generals beaten, there is no ſtrength in the reflexion: Beſides, he forgets that his Majeſtick Pope *Simplicius* tolerated the Arrians, who about this time poſſeſſed almoſt half the City of *Rome* (*k*), and yet he makes no remark of any Judgment on him.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 468. n. 24. pag. 281.

(*k*) Idem. *An.* 483. n. 6. pag. 370.

There are many Evidences, that *Baronius* did not underſtand Greek, and one inſtance of it is, that when he had named the Heretical Biſhop of *Antioch*, *Petrus Cnapheus*, (that is in Greek) *Peter* the Fuller, he adds of his own, *idemq; Fullo nuncupatus eſt* (*l*), the ſame Man is called alſo *Peter* the Fuller.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 471. n. 6. pag. 287.

That

That *Baronius* is miſtaken as to *Ambroſius Aurelianus* (*m*), who was ſaluted Emperor in *Britain*, both as to the perſon and time, is made evident by our learned Country man Archbiſhop *Uſher* (*n*): To whom the Reader is referred, for a more exact account of that famous Man.

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 476. n. 2. & 477. n. 30, 31. pag. 338.
(*n*) *Uſher.* Antiqu. Brit. cap. 13. pag. 240.

It is very impertinent in *Baronius*, to upbraid the Reformed Chriſtians of theſe days, with the miraculous Confeſſion of the Orthodox in *Africa*, whoſe Tongues being cut out by the cruel *Arrians*, they ſtill ſpoke plainly, and owned the true Faith (*o*): For we confeſs the ſame Faith that they did, and have the ſame and no more Sacraments: But though theſe Biſhops did then ſay, they held the Faith that then was held in the Roman Church, that belongs not to the preſent Romaniſts, who have added new Articles to their Creed, new Sacraments, and ſet up many new Objects for Worſhip: So that if thoſe African Martyrs and Confeſſors were now alive, they would no more own theſe than they did the Vandals.

(*o*) *Baron. An.* 484. n. 94. pag. 411.

The cenſure of *Nicephorus*, who lived in a ſuperſtitious Age, and the Fictions deviſed in the ſecond Nicene Council to ſupport Image-worſhip, are no way credible. *Xenaias* (if ever there were ſuch a Man,) was not the firſt, who ſaid the Images of Chriſt and the Saints were not to be adored; and it ſeems by his affirming, that *Worſhip in Spirit and Truth was only acceptable to Chriſt* (*p*), that he had Read the holy Scripture more conſiderately than thoſe at *Rome* now, who overlook the ſecond Commandment, and many other places which expreſly condemn their Idolatry: So that for ought appears from any Author of his time now extant, this *Xenaias* was an Orthodox Chriſtian, however in this point.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 485. n. 16, &c. pag. 426, 427.

Baronius hath miſled *Binius* and others, touching the Age of *Fauſtus* the Semi-pelagian, as alſo the time of the two Councils in *France*, relating to his Opinions (*q*). But theſe and ſome other Errors are learnedly and acurately corrected by the famous *Voſſius* in his

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 490. n. 17. pag. 445, &c.

his Pelagian Hiſtory, to which I refer the Reader (*r*), for his own ſatisfaction.

(*r*) Hiſtor. Pelag. lib. 1. c. 50. pag. 106.

How often doth our Annaliſt cenſure the Eaſtern Emperors and Patriarchs, for tolerating Hereticks? How many dreadful Judgments (in his way of interpreting Providence) doth he note, came upon them for this ſingle Crime? Yet here we have an Heretical Emperor tolerated all his Reign for 17 year together, and his name allowed in the Dypticks, by many Succeſſive Popes, for near 30 year after his death (*s*). Surely he will not own ſo many Infallible Guides, before *Hormiſda*, were ignorant of *Zeno's* Hereſie; and if they did know it, their fault in tolerating him, and owning his Memory is much greater: How much ſo ever, therefore he would magnifie his Roman Biſhops care of the Catholick Faith, when Truth comes out, the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* in this Age did more Service to the Faith, than the Popes; and *Euphemius* threatned *Anaſtaſius* the Emperor into profeſſing the right Faith while *Fælix* flattered him (*t*); which is a good reaſon, why the pious Eaſtern Biſhops choſe to communicate with the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* rather than with the Popes, while the Churches were divided.

(*s*) Baron. *An.* 491. n. 4 pag. 455.

(*t*) Id. Ibid. n. 7, & 8 pag. 456.

It ſeems the Emperor *Anaſtaſius* in a controverſie about the Senſe of the Council of *Chalcedon*, *falſly thought to procure Peace by impoſing ſilence, both on the Catholicks and Hereticks*: And he is cenſured for this vain hope (*u*). But in a like caſe that happened afterward, Pope *Vigilius* alſo decreed (as he ſaith) *both ſides ſhould keep ſilence*; and this he calls *a Prudent care to preſerve the Church from danger* (*w*): So that *Baronius* makes that to be praiſe-worthy in a Pope, which is a grievous Crime in any Body elſe: Such partiality is very unbecoming in any Writer, but chiefly in an Hiſtorian.

(*u*) Baron. *An.* 492. n. 43. pag. 469.

(*w*) Id. *An.* 547. n. 41. pag. 361.

He gives it us, as an ingenious Argument of Pope *Gelaſius*, *That the cauſe between him and* Acacius *could not be judged at* Conſtantinople, *where the ſame perſons were Enemies, Witneſſes and Judges* (*x*): But this Pope aiming

(*x*) Baron. *An.* 493. n. 20. pag. 475.

ing at his Adverſary, like an unskilful Fencer hits himſelf: For this is a very ſtrong Reaſon, why *Acacius* his Cauſe ſhould not be judged by the Pope, an Enemy, a Witneſs and a Judge.

When a moſt pious Biſhop, the main ſupport of the Catholick Cauſe was depoſed and baniſhed, *viz. Euphemius*, the Annaliſt ſaith, *he deſerved to be abdicated by Gods juſt Judgment, for not obeying the Popes in abdicating* Acacius *his Name*—— and he pretends the Fathers ſay, *there can be no Confeſſors or Martyrs out of the Roman Churuh* (y). Whereas *Cyril* the Monk, cited by our Hiſtorian ſaith, Euphemius *was impiouſly depoſed from his See, and exclaims againſt the wicked injuſtice of this Fact* (z); which this Mans prejudice makes him call *Gods juſt Judgment*. But God doth not puniſh Men for that which is no fault; and it was none in *Euphemius*, not to ſubmit to the Pope's moſt unjuſt claim of a Superiority over his Church, which had been exempted by two General Councils from all ſubjection, and advanced to the ſecond place among the Patriarchs. As for his other aſſertion, no Father of credit can be produced, that did appropriate Martyrdom, or Confeſſorſhip to thoſe in Communion with *Rome:* Yea, this very Age produced a great many Biſhops and holy Monks, ſuch as *Elias*, *Daniel Stylites*, St. *Sabas*, *&c.* who did not communicate with the Pope, but took part (in this conteſt) with *Euphemius*, who then were and ſtill are (even by *Baronius*) called Martyrs and Confeſſors. Yea, the Cardinal himſelf aſſerts, that thoſe who were ſlain, or ſuffered any thing in a petty conteſt at *Rome*, meerly about the choice of a Pope, were Martyrs and Confeſſors (*a*), though no Article of Faith came into the diſpute: And doubtleſs, he cannot rob theſe Eaſtern Martyrs and Confeſſors, (who ſuffered by Hereticks only for the true Faith) of their deſerved Titles.

(y) *Baron. An.* 495. n. 23. pag. 505.

(z) Id. ib. n. 24.

(a) Idem *An.* 502. n. pag. 543.

In like manner he uſes *Paſchaſius*, a learned and pious Roman Deacon, who never ſeparated from the Catholick Church; but when two ambitious Candidates,

ſcandalouſly ſtrove for the Papal Chair, he chanced to take the leſs fortunate ſide: And this he counts *dying in Schiſm*, and (without any Authority) takes it for granted, that he repented of it before his death, becauſe otherwiſe he thinks it was impoſſible he ſhould be ſaved (*b*). The ground of theſe remarks is an idle Legend, out of the fabulous Dialogues aſcribed to St. *Gregory*: But the Principles (of making it Schiſm and a mortal Sin to miſtake in a Popes Election) are his own.

(b) *Baron. An.* 498. n. 8. pag. 528.

To conclude this ſort of obſervations, it is very hard that *Symmachus ſhould long expect Letters from* Anaſtaſius *the Emperour, more majorum* (c); when the controverſie was yet ſcarce decided, who was Pope, he or *Laurentius*. And as for the *mos majorum*, that would have obliged *Symmachus* firſt to write to the Emperor, as his Predeceſſors uſe to do.

(c) *Baron. An.* 499. n. 11. pag. 530.

I need not make a new Head, to obſerve what excurſions he often hath to diſpute for the Roman ſide, which in an Hiſtorian is not allowable, ſince he is to relate pure matter of Fact, and neither to commend a Friend nor reproach an Enemy unjuſtly.

There are many of theſe digreſſions about *Acacius*, the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, againſt whom he moſt bitterly inveighs for a long time together; and treats him with language ſo rude and ſcurrilous, that one would think he was ſome Monſter or Devil incarnate (*d*). Yet at laſt his greateſt Crime is, (in compariſon of which all his other faults were light ones,) he *oppoſed the Pope!* who attempted to uſurp a Juriſdiction over him, and to rob him and his See of the Priviledges, which General Councils had granted to *Conſtantinople*: Otherwiſe (as hath been ſhewed,) he was a moſt Pious and Orthodox Man: And *Zeno* the Emperor who ſtood by his own Biſhop in this juſt Cauſe, cannot eſcape many ſevere laſhes from this partial Hiſtorian, who frequently goes out of his way and takes every little occaſion (*e*) to aggravate his Miſcarriages, yea, to rail at him without any cauſe.

(d) *Baron. An.* 478. n. 6. pag. 339.

(e) Id. ib. n. 7. pag. 340. & n. 12. pag. 341.

It

It is agreed by all impartial Hiſtorians, that the Emperor *Valentinian* the Third, did advance *Ravenna* to be a Patriarchal Seat, *An. Dom.* 432, and that it held this Dignity without any dependance on the See of *Rome*, till after the middle of the 7*th* Century (*f*). And how they ſtrugled to keep thoſe Liberties many years after, may be ſeen in a late Eminent Author (*g*). But *Baronius*, who allows a thouſand Forgeries for *Rome*, every where diſputes againſt this Priviledge, and condemns all that the Biſhops of *Ravenna* did (*b*): And here takes a boaſting threatning Letter of the Pope's, to be very good evidence, that all the Priviledges of the Church of *Ravenna* flowed from *Rome* (*i*). But beſides that his Witneſs is a party, we may note, the Priviledges were ſo large, that we may be ſure the Roman Church never granted them; their ambition to be abſolutely Supream, not allowing them to endure any Equal, eſpecially in *Italy*.

(*f*) See Dr. *Hammond.* of *Schiſm*, chap. 6. §. 12. pag. 355.

(*g*) Dr. *Cave* diſc. of ant. Gov. chap. 5. §. 4.

(h) *Baron. An.* 432. pag. 631. & *An.* 708. n. 2, 3, 4.

(*i*) Idem *An.* 482. n. 44. pag. 364.

Again, we have a digreſſion about the hard uſage of the Popes Legates at *Conſtantinople*; and he not only aggravates their Sufferings beyond what either his Authors ſay, or the truth will bear: But alſo takes occaſion to tell you, *that this is the way of Hereticks, to act by Violence and Terror, and to treat the Pious with Clubs, Swords and Priſons, inſtead of Charity and Peace* (k). Now if this be the character of Hereticks, the Roman Church that always did and ſtill doth proceed thus where it hath power, may fairly paſs for an Heretical Church. And as for the ground of this unlucky obſervation, *Zeno* and *Acacius* did nothing, but what all wiſe Governors would have done; for ſince theſe Legates of the Popes came to juſtifie an uſurped Authority, and to diſturb the quiet of the Church at *Conſtantinople*, their Letters (which were judged Seditious) were taken from them, and they (without any hurt to their perſons) ſecured, till Time and Diſcourſe had made them ſenſible how ill an errand they came upon: So that being convinced of the Juſtice of *Acacius* proceedings, they communicated with him, and let fall the Popes buſineſs.

(k) *Baron. An.* 484. n. 2, 3, &c. pag. 391.

I have touched that frivolous excurſion about the worſhip of Images before (*l*); I only note now, that if *Petrus Cnapheus* did oppoſe that idle Superſtition in its firſt riſe, he was more Orthodox than any who promoted it, as to that point; And it may be the later Hiſtorians, who dored upon the worſhip of Images, may have given this *Peter* a worſe name than he deſerved; Lying Characters of all Iconoclaſts, being as common with them as other fabulous Stories, which abound in the Writers of this Controverſie above all others.

(l) *Baron. An.* 485.n 16,&c. pag.426.

From two paſſages out of the Additions to *Gennadius*, writ by ſome unknown hand, mentioning two Books, one of *Honoratus* Biſhop of *Marſeils*, approved by *Gelaſius*, and another of *Gennadius* his own, preſented to that Pope, and one Example of *John Talaias* Apology ſent to his ſole Patron the ſame *Gelaſius*; Our Hiſtorian largely digreſſes, to prove that the Pope was the ſole Judge of all Writers and Writings, and talks as if he was the only *Cenſor librorum*, in that Age (*m*): Whereas I can name him divers other Biſhops of leſs eminent Sees, that had twice as many Books ſent to them for their approbation; yet none of their Succeſſors were ſo vain, as to challenge any Right from thence to judge of Orthodox Books: And for the Decree of *Gelaſius* about Apocryphal Writings, it is a meer Impoſture.

(m) *Baron. An.* 490.n.43. ad 47.pag.451, 452.

He complains of the Arrogance of the *Conſtantinopolitan* See, which inſulted over that of *Rome*, *as a Captive, and under a barbarous Yoke:* But he will ſcarce allow us to pity the Roman Church, ſince he runs out into vain boaſting, that *the Popes had the ſame Vigor, Authority, Power and Majeſty, now, that they had in the beſt times* (n). But his Account of the little regard given to this Pope *Gelaſius*, and his Predeceſſors Letters and Sentences in this Controverſie, confutes his Brags, and proves this Authority and Majeſty was only in imagination.

(n) *Baron. An.* 493.n.22. pag 475

§. 6. After

§. 6. After all theſe Artifices uſed by the Annaliſt for the intereſt of the Roman Church, one would not think any thing ſhould be left, that reflected either upon the preſent Doctrin or Practice of *Rome:* Yet Truth (like the Light) cannot be concealed with all his Artifices.

It appears that Pope *Leo* was but a mean Aſtronomer, ſince he could not Calculate the true time of *Eaſter* himſelf, but was forced to write to others to inform him; and when the Infallible Guide is forced to enquire of many Fallible perſons to direct him in his Decrees, it ſeems he is left to the ſame dull way, that other Mortals uſe for their information (*o*): And at this rate, Learning muſt be of more uſe to the Head of the Church, than Infallibility.

(o) *Baron. An.* 453. n. 34 & 40. pag. 189, 190.

He commends the barbarous Suevians and Vandals, for ſparing a Monaſtery in one of their Cruel Invaſions, and reproaches the Reformed in *France*, who had burnt very many Monaſteries and Churches, at which he thinks they may bluſh (*p*). But doubtleſs, *Lewis* the 14*th* hath more cauſe for bluſhing, ſince he profeſſes that Religion that gives an extraordinary reverence to Monaſteries, and yet without ſcruple, Burns, Demoliſhes and Deſtroys often where he Conquers.

(p) *Baron.* eod. *An.* n. 46. p. 191.

By a Letter writ to the Emperor *Leo* by *Anatolius*, it appears that the Eaſtern Emperors conſulted the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* in cauſes of Faith (*q*): And ordered them to conſult the Canons, and enquire into the violations of them; yea, to give notice to the Pope of ſuch offences. And after all, the Emperor was to give theſe Canons their due Force, by appointing the Puniſhment due to ſuch as had broken them: Which proceeding was thought very regular then; but the preſent Roman Court will not allow it, though Pope *Leo* himſelf begs of the Emperor, (not commands him, as our Hiſtorian words it,) *to uſe this remedy to the Church, not only to degrade Heretical Clerks,*

(q) *Baron. An.* 457. n. 34, &c. pag. 226.

Clerks, but to baniſh them from the City (r); yet now they will not have Princes to judge or puniſh Clerks: Nor will *Baronius* allow the Emperor a Right to call a General Council without the Pope's conſent: But the Letter of Pope *Leo*, from whence he infers this, ſhews, *He was commanded by the Emperor to come to a Council*, which Order the Pope reverently received, and wiſhed he could have obeyed it; but modeſtly hopes to be excuſed by the Emperors approving the Reaſons he offers, why there was no need of ſuch a Council (*s*). So that the Authority was then in the Emperor, and the Pope was to obey or excuſe himſelf by juſt Reaſons. And as to the confirmation, Pope *Leo* ſaith, *The Council of* Chalcedon *was confirmed by the Authority of* Marcian *the Emperor, and by his conſent* (t); yea, he owns, *the definitions of that Council were above him*; for *what was defined there, he durſt not call to a new ſcanning* (u): Thus things ſtood then, but *Rome* is now above this.

(r) *Baron. An.* 457. n. 43. pag. 228.

(s) Ibid. 45, 47. pag. 228, 229.

(t) *Baron. An.* 458 n. 9. pag 234.

(u) Ibid. n. 11.

If it were ſo excellent and pious a Law, that none ſhould force Women to be Nuns, nor any to be vailed till ſhe were forty years old, till which Age ſhe was to remain free to marry if ſhe pleaſed (*w*); How comes it to paſs that nothing is more common now, than to carry young Women againſt their Wills into Nunneries, and to make them take the Vows at fourteen or fifteen? Theſe practices may be gainful, but they are very wicked, and contrary to the Laws both of Church and State, in elder and purer times.

(w) *Baron. An.* 458. n. 4 & 5. pag. 233.

We may obſerve a viſible difference between the Prayers and Uſages of holy Men in this ancient Age, and thoſe of the modern times. St. *Marcian* takes the holy Goſpel in his hand, and directs his Prayers only to Chriſt to avert a dreadful Fire (*x*): But later Legends repreſent their modern Saints, taking up Crucifixes, Relicks or the Hoſt, and praying to the bleſſed Virgin, or to deceaſed Saints in all caſes of danger: So that any conſidering Reader may ſee, that the Primitive Worſhip was not like to that now uſed in the Roman Church.

(x) *Baron. An.* 465. n. 8, pag. 262.

Again,

Again, if the Matter of Fact be true, that Pope *Hilary* forbid the Emperor *Anthemius*, to allow any Conventicles of the Macedonian Hereticks in *Rome*, for which we have no proof, but the boasting Letter of a Bigotted Pope, *viz. Gelasius*; yet (supposing this were so) the Note of the Annalist is very Erroneous, *viz. That Heresies could not be planted at* Rome *so easily as at* Constantinople (y). For *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, who were as great Hereticks as *Eutyches* and *Ælurus*, were sheltered at *Rome* a long time (z): And the Bishops of *Constantinople* did more against *Eutyches* and his Heresie, than the Popes against *Pelagius*: And since a little after, three parts of seven in *Rome* were Arrians, tolerated by the Pope, methinks we should not have the Purity of *Rome* extolled at this rate, as if no Weed of Heresie could grow there. It is but five years after this that *Baronius* himself owns, that *Ricimer* seized on St. *Agathus* Church in *Rome*, where he and the Arrians held their publick Assemblies in spight of the Popes (a); who were not wont to oppose Princes who had great power, and only trampled on such as were weak.

(y) *Baron. An.* 467. n. 2. pag. 273.

(z) *Usherii*, Ant. Britan. lib. 1. cap. 8. pag. 115, &c.

(a) *Baron. An.* 472. n. 10. pag. 295.

In the Relation of *Cyril* the Monk, which *Baronius* so highly commends, it is not much for the credit of *Rome*, that a Catholick Bishop of *Jerusalem*, *Martyrius*, sends a Legate to the Emperor, to assist him in suppressing the Eutychian Hereticks, and not the Pope: And that a Saint from Heaven should call *Jerusalem the Mother of Churches* (b): For this Title is now wholly appropriated to *Rome*. But as to the Embassy sent to the Emperor against the Hereticks, *Martyrius* took the right course; for Pope *Simplicius* in his Letter to the same Emperor saith, *The Imperial Authority only can keep the Sheepfold of our Lords flock pure——from the contagion of Heresie* (c); which shews, the Pope's power was not considerable at that time.

(b) *Baron. An.* 477. n. 23, &25. pag. 336.

(c) Id. *An.* 478. n. 11. pag. 341.

It

It is ſomething remarkable alſo, That Pope *Fælix* in his Letter to *Zeno* the Emperor, ſhould affirm, *That* Euſtathius *Biſhop of* Antioch, *was the Preſident of thoſe Three hundred and eighteen Fathers aſſembled at* Nice (*d*). For now they will allow no General Council to be Authentick, wherein the Biſhop of *Rome* or his Legates do not preſide.

(d) *Baron. An.* 483. n. 72. pag. 386.

The Romaniſts proceedings againſt the Reformed, at their Councils of *Conſtance* and *Trent*, where ſome were Burnt for a Terror, and the oppreſſed party who held the right Faith, were cited before their Adverſaries, who took upon them to judge in their own Cauſe; theſe proceedings (I ſay), were an exact Tranſcript of the Arrian Methods in *Africk*, when they reſolved under the cover of a Conference to ſuppreſs the Orthodox Catholicks (*e*).

(e) *Baron. An.* 484. n. 48, 49, &c. pag. 401.

In the Story of finding St. *Barnabas* Relicks, we may obſerve all the Prayers and Hymns were directed only to God and Chriſt, not any to this or any other Saint; from which we may learn, That piece of Superſtition, (which now makes up ſo great a part of the Roman Offices) was unknown to thoſe Ages (*f*); and St. *Barnabas* declares, the chief Biſhop of *Cyprus* is not ſubject to any Patriarch; he doth not except the Pope; ſo that this Apoſtle ſeems not to have believed St. *Peter's* Univerſal Supremacy.

(f) *Baron. An.* 485. n. 8, 9, 10. pag. 424. vide aliud exemp. Anno 495. n. 26. p. 505.

Baronius preſents us alſo, with a Confeſſion of Faith made by one *Lucidus*, and approved by a Synod of Biſhops, wherein he declares, that he believes Eternal Fire, and the Flames of Hell prepared for deadly Sins: But there is not one word of Purgatory (*g*); which ſhews there was no ſuch place invented, or at leaſt believed by the Catholicks then: And the *7th* Epiſtle of Pope *Gelaſius* (as we noted) ſignifies, that *he knew of no other places in the next World, but Heaven and Hell.*

(g) *Baron. An.* 490. n. 29. pag. 448.

To

To conclude, the Annaliſt ſhuts up this Century with a Melancholy Note, *That at this time there was not one Chriſtian Catholick Prince in the World* (*b*). He might alſo have added, that all the Eaſtern Patriarchs were ſeparated from the Communion of the Roman Church, (although three of them that were Orthodox communicated with one another (*i*)): And he might have noted alſo, that at this juncture there was no certain Pope; and an Heretical Prince was then Judge of the pretences of *Symmachus* and *Laurentius*, the Rivals for that See. But the true Faith can ſubſiſt as well without a Pope, as without Orthodox Princes; the Church being founded on Chriſt that invincible Rock, againſt which the Gates of Hell can never prevail.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 499. n. 13. pag. 531.

(*i*) *An.* 496. n. 56. pag. 518.

The End of the Fifth Centry.

PART.

PART IV. CENT. VI.

CHAP. I.

Errors and Forgeries in the Councils, from the Year 500, *to the End of the Fifth General Council,* An. Dom. 553.

Binii Concil. Tom. II. Par. I. *Lab.* & *Coſſart.* Tom. IV.

§. 1. WE referred the Councils ſaid to be held under Pope *Symmachus*, to the beginning of this Century: And the firſt Six are pretended to be held at *Rome*. The firſt was to prevent Mens ſeeking Biſhopricks, eſpecially the Papacy, while the See was full (*a*): On which we may note the Cunning of this Pope, who probably had got the Papcy by this means; yet ſees fit to condemn a Fault after he had made his advantage by it. The Fourth Canon plainly ſuppoſes that the Pope will name his Succeſſor, unleſs he die ſuddenly; which is expreſly contrary to the ancient Canons; which the Notes can neither totally conceal, nor fairly excuſe (*b*). But I look upon the Acts to be intirely forged in the later Times, as the groſs barbarity of the Style ſhews; and 'tis not probable that 72 *Italian* Biſhops ſhould come to *Rome* as ſo many Cyphers, only to applaud what this Pope did ignorantly and Uncanonically decree. 'Tis

(a) *Bin.* p. 519. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 1314.

(b) *Bin.* p. 521. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 1317.

'Tis certain there was a Synod at *Rome* called by the *Arrian* King *Theodoric*, which is perhaps ſuppreſſed by the Editors, leſt it ſhould diſcover the Regal Power was then above the Papal: And this new Stuff ſeems to be put into the old Garment, to fill up the Rent (*c*). Now *Baronius* and *Binius* place this Synod before the Kal. of *May An.* 499. (*d*), and fall foul upon *Theodorus Lector*, for ſaying, That *Theodoric* called this Synod, whereas he knew nothing of this Fiction: He ſaith indeed, *That after the Schiſm had laſted Three years*, (*which muſt be* An. 501. *ſince Pope* Anaſtaſius *died* An. 498.) Theodoric, *who then Ruled all at* Rome, *called a Synod of Biſhops, and ſetled* Symmachus *in the Papal Chair* (e). So that according to him, no body called this Synod of the Editors, nor was *Symmachus* yet Pope; but theſe are devices to make the Schiſm ſeem ſhorter than it was. But *Theodorus* is of better Credit than the *Annaliſt*, and *Caſſiodorus* ſhews, that this Schiſm was not fully ended until *Symmachus* his death, 13 or 14 years after: For he ſaith, That in his Conſulſhip (*An.* 514) he had united the Roman Clergy and People, and reſtored the deſired Concord to that Church (*f*) So that 'tis certain there was a Schiſm at this time, and long after.

(*c*) Luke V. 36.

(*d*) *Bin.* in not. pag. 520. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1317. *Baron An.* 499. n. 1. pag. 529. & n. 10. pag. 530.

(e) *Theod.* Lect. collect. lib. 2. pag. 186.

(f) *Caſſiod.* Chron. An. 514. inter opera. pag. 14. *An. Dom.* 500.

The Second Roman Council under *Symmachus* hath no Voucher, but *Anaſtaſius*, who pretends it was called to condemn *Petrus Altinenſis*, King *Theodoric*'s Viſitor, as an Invader of the Roman See. But 'tis no way probable, this yet unſetled Pope durſt do ſo bold a thing, conſidering *Theodoric*, (to whoſe Arbitration they had ſubmitted this, and commended him for determining it by a Biſhp) was then at *Rome* in great glory, loved and admired both by the Synod and People (*g*). But the ſport is, *Binius* and *Baronius* do not agree whether this were a diſtinct Synod, or only one Action of another Synod called *Palmaria*; however, the diſpute being about ſo frivolous a Fiction, we ſhall not interpoſe.

(g) *Bin.* p. 521. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 1322. *Baron. An.* 500. n. 2. pag. 536.

An. Dom. 501. 'Tis probable upon *Theodoric*'s having declared *Symmachus* the true Pope, his Enemies accuſed him of heinous Crimes: To cover which, a Synod is patch'd up, ſo full of Barbariſms, Falſe Latin and Non-ſenſe, that it ſeems to have been writ by that Ignorant Hand who forged the ridiculous Council of *Sinueſſa* for Pope *Marcellinus*; and the deſign of both is the ſame, *viz.* to make us think, that a Pope cannot be judged by a Council, neither for Idolatry nor for Adultery (*h*). Beſides, the Forger miſtakes the Conſul's Names; and *Ruffus Magnus* put in as Colleague to *Fauſtus Avienus*, inſtead of *Pompeius*, who is by two undoubted Writers of this Age (*i*), joyned with *Avienus*, as the Notes and Annaliſt confeſs, who yet have the confidence to ſay theſe Acts are genuine (*k*). But it ſeems they ſcarce think ſo, for theſe Acts ſay expreſly, *The Council was called by the Precept of* Theodoric; and own, that *they could decree nothing without that Princes knowledge.* Yet theſe Paraſites contradict their ſo commended Acts, and affirm this Synod was called by the Pope, who was the Criminal; yea, though they immediately after print ſome ſuſpicious Precepts of *Theodoric* about his calling and directing this whole proceſs (*l*). If the whole were not fictitious, I might note, That there is a manifeſt Corruption in the Acts; for where the Roman Churches Grandeur is ſaid to flow, *Firſt from* S. Peter's *Merit, then following our Lord's Command, and the Authority of General Councils* (m), The Period is not ſenſe, and *juſſione Domini* ſeems put in to make the Flattery ſtill groſſer: But the Editor's Margin hath a glorious Note on this blunder, and *Baronius* cites it with great Triumph. Another Trick the Notes put upon theſe Acts, which in the next Sentence *declare, that* Symmachus *and his Biſhops, deſired Letters from the King's Clemency for calling this Synod.* Which the Annotator turns, as if the King deſired the Popes Letters, and though he was an *Arrian*, durſt not call it without ſuch Letters (*n*); which Note is as falſe, as it is impertinent. For we ſee by *Theodorus Lector*, That *Theodoric* did call the real Council:

(*h*) *Bin.* p. 521. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 1323.

(*i*) *Marcellinus* & *Caſſiodorus* in Chronic.

(*k*) *Bin.* not. p. 523. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 1327.

Baron. An. 501. n. 1. pag 539.

(*l*) Præcept. regis *Theod.* *Bin.* pag. 524. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1328.

(*m*) *Bin.* p. 525. col. 1. *La.* 1323. *Baron. An.* 502. n. 6. p. 502.

(*n*) *Bin.* not. pag. 525. col. 1. *Lab.* 1332.

Council: And *Zonaras* ſaith, *Theodoric——calling a Council, rejected* Laurentius, *and confirmed the Biſhoprick of* Rome *to* Symmachus (*o*). And they muſt be able to out-face the *Sun*, who out of a falſly expounded Period would prove, that the Kings of that Age called no Councils without the Popes conſent.

(*o*) *Zonar.* in vit. *Anaſtaſ.* Tom. 3. p. 121.

Symmachus his 4*th* Roman Synod (of which *Baronius* makes the two former to be only divers Acts) is ſaid to be held when *Avienus* Junior was Conſul; but the name of his Colleague is omitted, which was *Probus*, This makes it ſomewhat ſuſpicious; but the buſineſs of it confirms that Suſpicion, which was to revoke two Laws made in a Roman Synod after *Simplicius* his Death, wherein (according to ancient Cuſtom) *Baſilius*, Præfect for *Odoacer* King of *Italy*, was preſent, with ſome Biſhops and the Roman Clergy (*p*). The firſt Law was, *That no Pope ſhould be elected, without the conſent of the King of* Italy (*then Lord of* Rome.) The other, *That no Pope, Biſhop or other Clergy-man ſhould alienate things given to the Church.* Which Laws they pretend to annul, becauſe they were both made by Laymen, and not ſubſcribed by any Pope. But firſt, It is certain that Lay Princes made many Laws in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, by Advice of their Clergy; and theſe were frequently confirmed in Synods. Secondly, Theſe Laws were made in a Council of the Clergy, as appears by that Title *Sanctitati veſtræ*, uſed by *Baſilius*; and *Eulalius* in this Council confeſſes theſe Laws were made, *ſome Biſhops conſenting to them* (*q*). Moreover, the deceaſed Pope had directed the making theſe Laws. And the Annotator (who here objects, They were made in the Vacancy of the See), in another place ſaith, *The Roman Clergy well knew, that when the Pope, the viſible Head of the Church, was taken away, it was their part, by ancient Cuſtom (as the neareſt Members to the Head, and Adminiſtrators of* Peter's *Church) to take care of the Univerſal Church* (*r*). Wherefore he cannot fairly deny, but the Roman Clergy had power in the Vacancy, to confirm a Law relating to the good ordering of their own

(*p*) *Bin.* p. 525. col. 2. *Lab.* 1332.

(*q*) *Bin.* p. 526. col. 2. *Lab.* 1336.

(*r*) *Bin.* Tom. I. pag. 102. notis ad vit. *Fabian.*

own Church: And the bloody Conteſt (not yet appeaſed) occaſioned by a double election which was lately ſubmitted to be judged by *Theodoric*, makes it very improbable this Law ſhould be repealed now, when ſo freſh an inſtance convinced them, that their Schiſms would be endleſs and intolerable if Princes did not interpoſe. And *Symmachus* muſt be an ill man when he got the Chair purely by *Theodoric*'s approbation, to kick down the ſtep upon which he was raiſed, and to take away his right to confirm, by whom his doubtful Title was confirmed. And finally, neither this *Theodoric* nor his Succeſſors, did ever take any notice of this Repeal, but in every vacancy did interpoſe. So that I take this Synod to be a Fiction to cover over the Power that a Lay Prince here exerciſed in making a Pope, or if there ever were ſuch a Synod it was deſpiſed, and the Law was in force after this aſſembly had revoked it. And thus all *Baronius* his Oratory about *Symmachus* his courage, and exalting himſelf above Kings and Princes (*s*) vaniſhes into air, and is as falſe as this Popes excommunicating *Anaſtaſius* the Emperor in this Synod; which is only proved by a corrupt reading of (*ego*) for (*nego*) as I ſhewed before.

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 502. n. 29. pag. 546.

For the other Law to forbid alienations, they pretend to repeal it meerly becauſe it was made by Lay-men (which is falſe); But the Clergy here reeſtabliſh it. If the Acts were genuine, I ſhould gueſs this was to put it in the Clergies power to diſpenſe with themſelves and their Canon, whenever they had a mind to be ſacrilegious: Since while a Royal Law forbad it, a Royal Licence muſt be firſt obtained, which would be hard to procure. But the power of *Theodoric* and *Symmachus* his circumſtances then, make it clear he durſt not repeal a Law of the Prince. So that it ſeems to be forged. Wherefore I will make but two remarks more, Firſt upon that Sentence in the Acts *Quia non licuit Laico ſtatuendi in Eccleſiâ (præter Papam Romanum) habere aliquam Poteſtatem* (*t*). *That no Layman, but the Pope, ſhall have any power to decree in the Church.* Which paſſage ſuppoſes the

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 526. col. 1. *Lab.* 1336.

the Pope a Lay-man, and is too ridiculous to be ſpoken by *Laurentius* Biſhop of *Milan*. Secondly, on the Notes I remark, that it is very ſtrange this Synod ſhould excommunicate *Anaſtaſius* for communicating with Hereticks ſuppoſed, ſince the former Synod complements *Theodoric* a profeſſed Arrian (the worſt of Hereticks) with the Titles of *moſt pious and moſt holy* (*u*): If the former were as true as this latter of giving theſe titles is, it would more need to be excuſed than this: But the truth is, the Popes were then ſo low, that they were, forced to give flatering Titles both to the Emperor and the Gothick Kings, whatever Religion they were of.

(*u*) Not. in Synod. 3. *Bin.* pag. 525. col. 1. *Lab.* 1333 *Baron. An.* 502. n. 21. pag. 545.

After this Council is added an Apology writ (to anſwer a Paper (now ſuppreſſed) againſt *Symmachus*) by *Ennodius*, wherein as far as appears by the Objections he cites, and the Anſwers he gives, the Accuſers of this Pope were too hard for his Apologiſt. The Annaliſt and *Binius* highly magnifie this Tract; yet the former confeſſeth *by the harſhneſs of the ſtyle, and the horrid unevenneſs of a falſe Copy, the quickeſt wit can ſcarce apprehend it* (*w*). As to the matter of it, the Author huffs at a rate which ſhews more zeal than judgment; and we note, Firſt, that he clearly owns *Theodoric* called the Synod that abſolved *Symmachus* (*x*), and therein confutes both his admirers, *Baronius* and *Binius*. Secondly, whereas his objectors rightly urge that the Apoſtle commands us not to keep company with a Brother that is a Fornicator (*y*) as (*Symmachus* was ſaid to be) *Ennodius* ſaith it is the Prophet *David*, and not the Apoſtle which gives this advice (*z*). Thirdly, he ridiculouſly affirms that S. *Peter* (who was not innocent) tranſmitted Innocence as an inheritance to the Popes, and wonders any ſhould fancy or imagine that a Pope ſhould not be holy, who hath ſo high a dignity, and is præordained (as he blaſphemouſly ſpeaks) to be the Foundation on which the weight of the Church leans (*a*), as if the very Chair gave grace to a profligate Wretch. Fourthly, He falſifies the Scripture, in ſaying *Samuel* appealed to the Lord, that men might not exmaine him (*b*); Whereas the Text expreſly ſaith he

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 503. n. 13. p. 552.

(*x*) *Bin.* p. 528. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1342.

(*y*) 1 Cor. 5. 11.

(*z*) *Bin.* p. 541. col. 1. *Lab.* 1342.

(*a*) *Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* col. 1343.

(*b*) *Bin.* pag. 542. col. 2. *Lab.* 1346.

he appealed to the People (before the Lord and the King) and challenged the People to prove any ill thing upon him, 1 *Sam.* xii. 3. Fifthly, his Maxim, *That* Peter's *Succeſſors were only to be judged by God*; was not believed by the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* (*c*), nor by *Theodoric*, nor any who had a hand in cenſuring or depoſing any Biſhops of *Rome*. Laſtly, if this Book, which is ſo Barbarous in its ſtyle, ſo abounding in railing and miſtakes, and ſo void of true reaſon, were approved and applauded in the Fifth Council; We may gueſs at the Qualifications of thoſe Biſhops who ſat in it. As for the Editors and *Baronius*, it is enough that it pleads for a Pope, for they muſt extol it.

(*c*) *Bin.* pag. 544 col. 2. *Lab.* 1352.

An. Dom. 503. The Fifth Roman Synod hath all the marks of Forgery imaginable; for the Conſuls are not named; and the Indiction is alſo falſe (as *Baronius* confeſſeth) (*d*). And he with *Binius* own that the Subſcriptions are ſo monſtrouſly falſified, that many Biſhops are named here, who were at the Council of *Chalcedon* 52 years before, and belonged to the Eaſtern Church, who alſo had been long ago dead and buried (*e*). And it is highly improbable, that 216 Biſhops ſhould meet only to approve ſuch ſtuff, and to order this Book *to be inſerted among the Apoſtolical Decrees to be obeyed by all, as they were* (*f*). This phraſe alſo ſmels of a late Forgery; for in the time of this pretended Synod, the name of Apoſtolical Decrees was not appropriated to Papal deciſions, nor were their Decretals univerſally Obeyed. For we ſee that in *Rome* it ſelf a great party both deſpiſed and writ againſt Pope *Symmachus* his Synodical abſolution Again, here is that fooliſh Sentence, *That the ſheep muſt not judge their Paſtor, unleſs he err in Faith, nor yet accuſe him but for injuſtice* (*g*), which is undoubtedly ſtolen out of a Decretal Epiſtle forged by *Mercator* long after this time; and it is wrong applied too, if *Symmachus* were ſo unjuſt as to rob his neighbors of their Chaſtity. Wherefore the very Book of *Ennodius* is ſuſpicious, and this Synod is moſt certainly Forged to ſave the credit of an ill Pope.

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 503. n. 1. pag. 549.

(*e*) *Bin.* not. p. 550. col. 1. *Lab.* 1370. *Baron.* ut ſupra. n. 9.

(*f*) *Bin.* pag. 547. col. 2. *Lab.* col. 1364.

(*g*) *Bin.* pag. 548. col. 1. *Lab.* 1365.

The

The Sixth Roman Council hath no date; but the Subſcriptions are certainly forged, having (like the former) the names of many Eaſtern Biſhops who could not be in this Synod. The Acts are a Rhapſody out of ſome later Councils againſt Sacriledge (*b*), as appears by divers barbarous phraſes, and ſome expreſſions, that are the dialect of more modern Ages, ſuch as that *of mens giving to the Church, for the remiſſion of their Sins,* (& æternæ vitæ mercatione), *and for purchaſing eternal life. The declaring alſo that the Sacrilegious are manifeſt Hereticks, is too abſurd for this Age.* They further ſay, *That the Canons of* Gangra *were confirmed by Apoſtolical Authority:* The Forger meant, *by Papal Authority.* But thoſe Biſhops at *Gangra* ſcarce knew who was then Pope: And it is plain the Compiler of this Council had reſpect to a Forgery of later Ages, where *Oſius* of *Corduba*'s name (the pretended Legate of the Pope) is added to the Synodical Letter from this Synod; and therefore theſe Acts were deviſed long after this Council is pretended to have ſitten. And he muſt be a meer ſtranger to the Hiſtory of this Time, who reads here that *Symmachus* and his Council ſhould ſay, *It is not lawful for the Emperor, nor any other profeſſing Piety, &c.* For this ſuppoſes *Anaſtaſius* no Heretick, and that Popes then preſcribed Laws to the Emperor of the Eaſt (*i*). I conclude with a ſingle remark upon the Notes on this forged Council, which pretend, *Theodoric* obeyed this Councils Decree (*k*) in ordering the patrimony of the Church of *Milan* to be reſtored to *Euſtorgius*, who was not in this Council, nor Biſhop of *Milan* till eight years after: And no doubt that Order was made by *Theodoric* in pure regard to Equity; for it is no way likely that he had ever heard of this Council. I conclude theſe Roman Councils with one remark relating to Monſ. *du-Pin*, who hath taken things too much upon truſt, to be always truſted himſelf, and therefore he publiſhes five of theſe ſix Councils for genuine (*l*), and gives almoſt the Baronian Character of *Symmachus*. But theſe Notes I hope will demonſtrate he is miſtaken, both in his Man and theſe Synods; and I

(*b*) *Bin.* p 550. col. 1. *Lab.* 1371.

(*i*) *Bin.* pag. 551. col. 2. *Lab.* 1375.

(*k*) *Bin.* p. 553. col. 1. *Lab.* 1378.

(*l*) *Du-Pin*, Vol. 5. pag. 108.

only deſire the Reader to compare his Account with theſe ſhort Remarks.

An. Dom. 506. §. 2. There were few Councils abroad in this Popes time, and he was not concerned in them. The Council of *Agatha* (now *Agde*) in the Province of *Narbon*, was called by the conſent of *Alaricus* an Arrian King; *Cæſarius* Biſhop of *Arles* was Preſident of it, and divers good Canons were made in it (*m*); but *Symmachus* is not named, ſo that our Editors only ſay it was held *in the time of* Symmachus. I ſhall make no particular remark but on the Ninth Canon, where *Cæſarius* (who was much devoted to promote that Celibacy of the Clergy which now was practiſed at *Rome*) and the Council declare *that the orders of* Innocent *and* Siricius *ſhould be obſerved* (*n*). From whence we may Note, that theſe Orders had not yet been generally obeyed in *France*, and that a Popes Decretal was of no force there by vertue of the Authority of his See, but became obligatory by the Gallican Churches acceptance, and by turning it into a Canon in ſome Council of their own. But that the uſages of *Rome* did not preſcribe to *France* is plain from the Notes on the xii Canon, where it appears their Lent Faſt was a total abſtinence till evening, none but the infirm being permitted to dine (*o*). But the Roman Lent (unleſs they have altered their old rule) allows men to dine in Lent with variety of ſome ſorts of meat and drink, which is not ſo ſtrict by much as this Gallican cuſtom.

(*m*) *Bin.* pag. 554 col. 2. *Lab.* 1381.

(*n*) *Bin.* pag. 555. col. 1. *Lab.* 1384.

(*o*) Not. in Con. xii. *Bin.* pag. 560. col. 1. *Lab.* 1398.

An. Dom. 507. The firſt Council of *Orleance*, is only ſaid to be in *Symmachus* time (*p*); but the Acts ſhew he was not conſulted nor concerned in it. The Biſhops were ſummoned by the Precept of King *Clovis*, who alſo gave them the heads of thoſe things they were to treat of. And when their Canons were drawn up, they ſent them (not to *Rome*, but) to their King for Confirmation, with this memorable addreſs, *if thoſe things which we have agreed on ſeem right to your judgment, we deſire your aſſent, that ſo the Sentence of ſo many Biſhops by the approbation of*

(*p*) *Bin.* pag. 561. col. 1. *Lab.* 1404.

ſo

ſo great a Prince, may be obeyed, as being of greater Authority. And *Clovis* was not wanting in reſpect to them; for he ſtiles them *Holy Lords, and Popes moſt worthy of their Apoſtolical Seat.* By which it is manifeſt, that *Rome* had then no Monopoly of theſe Titles.

I conclude that which relates to Pope *Symmachus* his time with one Remark, that in the year 500 the Devout and learned African *Fulgentius* came on purpoſe to viſit *Rome*: But the writer of his life, who acurately deſcribes what the holy Man ſaw there, and largely ſets forth his View of *Theodoric*, his viſiting the Tombs of the Martyrs, and ſaluting the Monks he met with (*q*), ſpeaks not one Syllable of the Pope, whoſe Benediction one would think *Fulgentius* ſhould have deſired: But whether the Schiſm yet continued, or *Symmachus* his manner did not pleaſe the good Man, 'its plain he took no notice of him.

(*q*) Vita B. *Fulgen.* cap. 13. pag. 16.

§. 3. *Hormiſda* ſucceeded *Symmachus*, and it ſeems by the Letter of *Dorotheus*, that in his Election (and not before) the Schiſm at *Rome* ceaſed, which began when *Symmachus* was choſen (*r*); which ſhews that *Symmachus* having a ſtrong party againſt him all his time, could do nothing conſiderable. This Pope *Hormiſda* was either married before he was Pope, or was very criminal; for he had a Son, *i.e. Sylverius*, who (as *Liberatus* teſtifies) was Pope about twenty years after him (*s*). This was a bold and active Pope, and did labour much to reconcile the Eaſtern to the Weſtern Church, and at laſt (in ſome meaſure) effected it, after the Greeks *had been ſeparated* (as *Binius* notes) *from the unity of the Church* (not Catholick, but) *of* Rome (*he means*) *about* 80 *years* (*t*). From whence we may obſerve, that a Church, may be many years out of the Communion of the Roman Church, and yet be a true Church; for none (till *Baronius*) ever ſaid the Eaſtern was not a true Church all the time of this Separation. The Notes further tell us, that King *Clovis* of *France* ſent *Hormiſda* a Golden Crown ſet with precious ſtones, for a Preſent, and thereby procured this reward

An. Dom. 514.

(*r*) Ep. *Dorothei* ap. *Baron. An.* 515. 7, 8. pag. 642.

(*s*) *Liberati* Brev. cap. 22. *Bin.* par. 2 pag. 191.

(*t*) *Bin.* not. in vit. pag. 557. col. 1. *Lab.* 1439.

ward from God, that the Kingdom of the Franks ſtill continues (*u*). Which ſtuff is out of *Baronius* (*w*). But the Story is as falſe as the inference; for *Sirmondus* proves that King *Clovis* died *Anno* 511, that is, three years before *Hormiſda* was Pope (*x*): *Labbè*, who owns this to be an Error, would correct the miſtake, and put in *Childebert*'s name; but he who told the Story, could certainly have told the Kings right name (*y*); wherefore we reject the whole Relation as fabulous: And for the inference, the Kingdom of *Franks* indeed like all other Kingdoms (who ſent no Crowns) hath continued, but not in *Clovis* his Poſterity, which is long ſince extinct. We ſhall make more remarks on this Popes Hiſtory in his Letters.

(*u*) *Bin.* not. pag. 556. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1418.
(*w*) *Baron. An.* 514. n. 14. pag. 632.
(*x*) *Labbè* in marg. 1420. & Tom. V. col. 305.
(*y*) *Labbè* 1417. & 1418. marg.

And many Epiſtles are lately found of this Popes in the Vatican, or Forged there, which we will now conſider.

The Firſt Epiſtle is certainly Forged, it is directed to *Remigius*, but names King *Lovis* or *Clovis*, who was dead three year before, as *Labbè* owns (*z*); for which cauſe *Sirmondus* omitted it as Spurious, and ſo *P. de Marca* counts it (*a*). And it is almoſt the ſame with another feigned Epiſtle, wherein the Pope is pretended to make a Spaniſh Biſhop his Legate there (*b*): But the Reader muſt beware of all ſuch Epiſtles, being generally writ by later Paraſites of *Rome*, who would have it thought, that all the Eminent Biſhops in the World, acted by a Power delegated from the Pope.

(*z*) Ep. 1. *Hormiſd. Bin.* pag. 557. col. 2. *Lab.* 1420.
(*a*) *De Marca* DeConcord. l. 5. cap 42. §. 6.
(*b*) Ep. 26. *Horm. Bin.* 578. col. 2. *Lab.* 1468.

The Second and Fourth Epiſtles are this Popes excuſe, why he did not go, but ſend his Legates to a Council in the *Eaſt*, unto which the Emperor *Anaſtaſius* had ſummoned him, *more majorum* (*c*): Which ſhews that as yet the Emperors had the power of calling Councils, and ſent their Precepts to the Pope himſelf.

(*c*) Ep 2. & 4. *Hor. Bin.* pag. 558, &c. *Lab.* 1422, &c.

The Fifth Epiſtle is alſo to excuſe *Hormiſda's* not going, The Title of which is falſe, viz. *That it was a new thing for a Pope to be called to a Council by the Emperor* (*d*). For the Letter it ſelf only ſaith, *there is no*

(*d*) Ep. 5. *Hor. Bin.* 561. col. 2. *Lab.* 1430.

Example

Example of a Pope going in perſon to a Council (in Foreign Parts). But as to the Summons, that was no new thing; for Pope *Celeſtine* was called to *Epheſus* by *Theodoſius*, and *Leo* to *Chalcedon* by the Emperor *Marcian.* And in this Letter *Hormiſda* highly commends *Anaſtaſius*, for *Writing to him to be there in perſon*; and ſays, *God moved the Emperor to write this.*

The Third Epiſtle is a reply to *Dorotheus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, who calls the Pope *his Fellow Miniſter, in the Inſcription.* But *Binius* (contrary both to *Baronius* and *Labbe*) corrupts the Title and Text of the Epiſtle of *Dorotheus* (e), reading *Patri*— inſtead of—*Papæ*; and twice in ſix lines putting *venerando capiti noſtro*,—for—*veſtro*: Now the true reading, *I have writ this to your venerable Head*, means no more, *but to your ſelf*: Whereas the corruption tends to impoſe upon the Reader a falſe conceipt, *viz.* That the Pope was *the Father and Head of all Biſhops.*

(e) Ep. *Doroth. Bin.* pag. 558. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1422. *Baron. An.* 511. n. 8. pag. 642. Vid. n. 11. ubi legit (*veſtro.*)

The Sixth Epiſtle ſhews, that *Hormiſda* for two years after his advancement into the infallible Chair, took *Anaſtaſius* for an Orthodox Emperor (*f*). But *Baronius* had expoſed him as a known Heretick, and Perſecutor of the Orthodox many years before; and *Binius* Notes charge him with the Eutychian Hereſie (*g*) at this very time: Which ſhews *Hormiſda* was very meanly qualified for an univerſal Judge, in matters of Faith. I add, that in this Epiſtle the Pope declares, *He will throw himſelf down at the Emperors Feet for the Service of the Church.* But after-times have ſeen an Emperor falling down at the Popes Feet, and kiſſing his Slipper.

(f) Ep. 6. *Hormiſd. Bin.* pag. 563. col. 2. *Lab.* 1436.

(g) Not. in Ep. *Anaſ. Bin.* pag. 563. Col. 1. *Lab.* 1435.

The Title of the Epiſtle of *John* Biſhop of *Nicopolis*, calls the Pope (if it be genuine) *Father of Fathers, and Prince of all Biſhops* (h). However it can only mean, That the Pope was a chief Biſhop, becauſe in the ſame Title he ſtyles him *his fellow Miniſter*, and in the Epiſtle ſaith his Predeceſſor *Alciſo*, was *a Prince of Biſhops*, who was only an Archbiſhop over a few Suffragans, and there were but eight Biſhops in this Synod of

(h) Ep. *Johan. Nicop. Bin.* pag. 564. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1438.

of *Epirus* (*i*), of whoſe complying with the Pope, *Baronius* brags, as if all the Eaſtern Church had ſubmitted.

(*i*) Baron. *An.* 516. N. 47. pag. 663.

In the Eighth Epiſtle, the Pope diſtinguiſhes *the Apoſtolical* (that is, the Roman) from *the general Catholick Church*; where he affirms that theſe Hereticks were Condemned, both by the one and the other.

After the Ninth Epiſtle we have a Paper called *a Form of Faith*, pretended to be ſent with theſe Letters, to be ſubſcribed by theſe Biſhops of *Epirus*; but yet is dated the year after theſe Letters, and hath other marks of Forgery; the matter of it being not deſigned to ſecure the Articles of the Old Creeds, but to enſlave all Churches to believe implicitely as the Church of *Rome* did, which is ſo groſly flattered in it, that *Hormiſda* might well bluſh at it, and muſt take thoſe who would ſubſcribe it, for his Vaſſals. But doubtleſs, this was deviſed after the Supremacy and Infallibility were got much higher: And we may obſerve, the Forger of it not only claps it in here, but makes *Juſtin* the Emperor ſign it, and ſend it to Pope *Boniface*, after that Emperor and Pope were both dead, where *Binius* and *Labbè* condemn it for an Impoſture (*k*): And the deviſer of it is ſo fond of it, that he hath thruſt it in moſt falſly and impertinently, in four or five ſeveral places of the Councils.

(*k*) Profeſs. Fidei. *Bin.* pag. 645. col. 1. *Lab.* 1686.

After all the Noiſe of the *Subjection of the Eaſtern Churches to the Roman, all the Letters of this time, mention no more than the Agreement and Concord of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches*: So *Avitus* enquires, *if they were reconciled and a Concord was made* (*l*). *Juſtin* the Emperor ſaith, he laboured *pro Concordia*, &c. (*m*). And *Hormiſda* himſelf ſpeaks of it *as an Union*, and *a receiving the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *into an Unity of Communion* (*n*); Which ſhews the Eaſtern Church owed no ſubjection then to *Rome*.

(*l*) Ep. *Avit. Bin.* p. 568. col. 1. *Lab.* 1445.
(*m*) Ep. *Juſtin. Bin.* pag. 579. col. 2. *Lab.* 1470.
(*n*) Indic. *Hormiſd. Bin.* pag. 582. col. 2. *Lab.* 1476.

The inſtructions to the Legates laſt cited, are ſomething ſuſpicious, and look like the Work of a later Hand: But *Binius* is ſo taken with them, that he Prints them again *verbatim* (*o*), whereas *Labbè* omits them the ſecond time.

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 560. &. pag. 568.

The

The Seventeenth Epiſtle ſhews, that this Pope, under pretence of admitting inferior Biſhops to his Communion, broke in upon the Ancient Rights and Cuſtoms of Metropolitans, freeing their Suffragans from *the obedience they owed to their Superiors by the Canons* (*p*). And a little after, becauſe *Dorotheus* oppoſed this uſurpation, the Pope repreſents him as having forſaken Chriſt (*q*); a piece of Cant that is common with every petty Sect, in reſpect of all that are not of their party. And indeed the Epiſtle of *Anaſtaſius*, which follows this 22*d* Epiſtle declares, that *Hormiſda* was a ſtubborn and unmerciful man, and not only ſlighted the Emperor and injured him; but pretended to command him; which he ſaith, *He will not bear* (*r*); or as *Baronius* out of the Pontifical hath it, he told the Pope *He would Command, and not be Commanded* (*s*), which was not ſpoken in fury, but like a Prince; and had all his Succeſſors kept the Reins ſo ſtiff, they had curbed all the Papal uſurpations; yea, wholly prevented them.

(*p*) Ep. 17. *Hormiſd. Bin* pag. 573. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1456.

(*q*) Ep. 22. *Hormiſd. Bin.* pag. 575. col. 1. *Lab.* 1459.

(*r*) Ep. *Anaſtaſ. Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* 1460.

(*s*) *Baron An.* 517. n. 48. pag. 677.

The Relation of the Syrian Monks, which we have here in Latin, is corrupted in the Title, and abuſed by a ſilly Tranſlator (*t*). The Title is with great ſwelling words directed to *Hormiſda*; but the Text ſpeaks to a whole Synod of Biſhops, and ſays, *Riſe ye up holy Fathers* — and, *The Flock cometh to you true Paſtors and Doctors, to whom the Salvation of all is committed* (*u*); yet the Title appropriates all to the Pope ſingle, where the Tranſlator, for *Oecumenical Patriarch* (a name which is often given alſo to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*,) ignorantly, or by deſign hath *univerſæ orbis Terræ Patriarchæ*; And he calls the Weſtern Legate *Angelum veſtrum*, your Angel: 'Tis probable alſo, ſome ſuch Hand hath put in, *vos eſtis caput omnium*: Ye (not the Pope alone), *are the Head of all*; where our Editors marginal Note is, *The Pope is the Head of all.* But the boldeſt Forgery of all is, That *Binius* and *Labbè* make theſe Monks in the end of their Epiſtle accurſe Acacius *Biſhop of* Conſtantinople, *who did communicate with the Hereticks*, which

(*t*) *Bin.* pag. 575. col. 2. *Lab.* 1461.

(*u*) Ib. *Bin.* 576. & *Lab.* 1462.

which is added by the Editors. For in *Baronius* (w) *Acacius* his name is not once mentioned, neither in his Edition at *Antwerp*, 1596. nor in that at *Venice*, 1601. So that we can ſcarce truſt any thing which comes through ſuch Mens hands.

(w *Baron. An.* 517. n 59. pag. 679. & pag 518.

The Twenty fourth Epiſtle, which pretends to make *John* Biſhop of *Tarragon* the Popes Legate, and ſpeaks of his coming to *Italy*, and having Papal Conſtitutions ſent him (x), not only confirms our Note, that all ſuch kind of Epiſtles are forged, but is certainly ſpurious it ſelf. For in this year (517,) this *John* preſided in the Council of *Gyrone* in *Spain*, where he and his fellow Biſhops made Canons, and take no notice of the Pope, or any Legantine Power: And the Editors differ about the date of this Epiſtle. And probably the next Epiſtle containing the Conſtitutions is forged alſo (y), being directed *to all the Biſhops of* Spain, who were not then under any one King nor Primate—— And whereas this Letter ſpeaks of *peaceable times*; it is certain theſe Gothick Arrian Kings, were almoſt continually at War with *France*, and with each other: However the Inventer of theſe Epiſtles is not very Modern: For he makes *Chriſt the Head of the Church, and Biſhops to be his Vicars*: And Penitents are here forbid to be choſen Biſhops, *becauſe they could not decently abſolve others, who had openly confeſſed their own Sins before the People.* Which ſhews, *the Pope was not Chriſts ſole Vicar then*: And that there was no Auricular Confeſſion when this was writ.

(x) Ep. 24. *Hormiſd. Bin.* pag. 577. col. 2. *Lab.* 1466.

(y) Ep. 25. *Hormiſd. Bin.* pag. 579. *Lab.* 1467.

An. Dom. 518. §. 3. *Juſtin* being upon *Anaſtaſius* his death unexpectedly made Emperor, gives the Pope notice of it, and requires his Prayers; This *Hormiſda* (if his Letter be genuine) craftily calls, *offering up the firſt fruits of his Empire to St.* Peter (z): And the Notes add, *That it was the ancient uſe to certifie the Pope of the new elected Emperor, and to requeſt him to confirm and conſecrate him.* But I have ſhewed it was a much more ancient Cuſtom, for the Pope to certifie the Emperor of his Election:

(z) *Horm.* Ep. 27. *Bin.* pag. 579. col. 1. *Lab.* 1470.

ction: Only when an Emperor came to the Throne without a good Title, (which was *Juſtin's* caſe,) it was ſuch an Emperor's intereſt to gain the Pope's favour. But as for either Conſecration or Confirmation, there is not one word of it; that is a device out of *Baronius* Brain, and the Annotator takes it from him of truſt(*a*); and he was owned Emperor by all, long before this notice.

(a) *Baron. An.* 518. n. 2, 3. pag. 2. Tom 7.

The Epiſtle of *John* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, in the Title calls *Hormiſda*, *His moſt Holy Brother and Fellow-Miniſter* (b); and in the Letter he calls him, *Moſt dear Brother in Chriſt*; which Phraſes *Epiphanius* alſo his Succeſſor uſes in his Epiſtle to the ſame Pope(*c*): And from *John's* Epiſtle we learn, that when Old *Rome* left out the names of the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, in their Dypticks; Theſe put out the Popes name from their Dypticks, which ſhews no ſubjection was owned or expected, and that the Eaſtern Church was on even ground with the Pope in thoſe days, deſpiſing his Communion as much as he did theirs.

(b) Ep. to *Conſt. Bin.* pag. 580. col. 1. *Lab.* 1472.
(c) Ep. *Epiph. Bin.* pag. 605. col. 2. *Lab.* 1534.

An Epiſtle writ to *Cæſarius* Biſhop of *Arles*, this year, is ſuſpicious, becauſe *Baronius* had mentioned his Will and Teſtament ten year before (*d*): But if he were now alive, we muſt correct the Title in *Binius*, where he is called, *The Vicar of the Apoſtolick See in* France: Which words are ſo manifeſt a Forgery that *Labbè* left them out. But we may ſuſpect the whole, ſince the Pope never names his laſt Embaſſy before this time received from the Emperor and Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, when he pretends to give an Account of the Affairs in the Eaſt to this *Cæſarius*.

(d) *Baron. An.* 508. n. 30. pag. 585.

The Legates Inſtructions here begin as the former did, *viz. When by Gods Mercy, ye come into the Eaſtern parts* (e), *&c.* and the Legates in their third Suggeſtion, aſcribe their ſafe Journy only *to Gods Mercy* (f). So that probably thoſe words (in the firſt inſtructions) — *and the Prayers of the Apoſtles*, are added by a later hand, when they uſed ſo often to pray to Saints, as to give them a ſhare of the Glory due to God for his Mercy.

(e) Indic. 2. *Bin.* pag. 582. col. 1. *Lab.* 1476.
(f) Sug. 3. *Bin.* pag. 585. col. 2. *Lab.* 1485.

The ſame hand, to countenance the ſame practice, ſeems to have corrupted the Thirty ſeventh Epiſtle, where *Hormiſda* tells *Juſtinian*—— *He did daily and humbly beſeech the Apoſtle* Peter, *that God might give a ſpeedy iſſue to his endeavours* (g): Which borders both on Blaſphemy and Nonſenſe, but probably the true reading was—*apud B.* Petrum——*obſecramus.* That the Pope pray'd daily at St. *Peter's* Church to God, for *Juſtinian's* ſpeedy ſucceſs.

(g) B. *Petrum* Ap.—obſecramus, Leg.—— apud B. *Petrum* Apoſtolum—— obſecramus. Ep. 37. *Hormiſd. Bin.* pag. 584. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1483.

That the Eaſtern and Weſtern Church were united about this time is true; but I am apt to believe, that thoſe many particular circumſtances, which *Baronius* and theſe Editors have out of a ſort of *reports of the Popes Legates, Letters and other Papers, lately found (it ſeems) in the* Vatican, *are of later invention.* The Epiſtle of *John* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, wherein he is pretended to ſubſcribe that flattering confeſſion of Faith, formerly ſaid to be ſubſcribed by the Biſhops of *Epirus* (h), is certainly a Forgery, that ſome Paraſite hath tranſcribed as often as any Eminent perſon was reconciled to the Pope; and therefore, a little after (as I noted but now) he aſcribes the ſame Form to the Emperor *Juſtin*, three years after he was dead: There is no proof of this *John's* ſubſcribing any ſuch Paper, but only the relation of *Dioſcorus*, one of the Pope's Legates, which is certainly falſe, becauſe he ſaith, *That at this time* (*An.* 519.) John *conſented to raſe the names of* Phravites, Euphemius, Macedonius *and* Timotheus *out of the Dypticks, as well as the name of* Acacius, upon which *Baronius* Triumphs moſt extreamly (*i*): But without any cauſe; for if he had not craftily omitted an Epiſtle of *Juſtinian's*, writ the next year (*k*), (which is in *Binius* (l),) it would have appeared that the Eaſtern Church would not yield to raſe out any more names, but only that of *Acacius.* But *Baronius* hath later Epiſtles of *Juſtinian* which expreſly ſay, (a year after this pretended raſing out the names of *Euphemius, &c.*) that only *Acacius* his Name was left out of the Dypticks, and that the ſcruple about the other names

(h) Libel *Joban. Bin.* pag. 586. Col. 1., *Lab.* 1486.

(i) *Baron. An.* 519. n. 54. pag. 32. Tom. 7.
(k) Id. *An.* 520. n. 4. pag 55.
(l) Ep. *Juſtinian. Bin.* pag. 610. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1547.

names was not to be medled with; for the Eaſtern Biſhops would never yield that point (*m*). And *Juſtin* the Emperor ſaith the ſame to *Hormiſda* (n); yea, in the year 521, we find the Emperor ſtill requiring the Pope ſhould communicate with thoſe who only left out *Acacius* his name, but kept in the other Biſhops names (*o*). All which is ſufficient to prove this Story of *Dioſcorus* to be a meer Fiction: Yet it may be confirmed alſo by the Chronicle of *Victor*; who mentions no Biſhops name of *Conſtantinople* but *Acacius*, that was rejected when the Emperor *Juſtin* reconciled the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops (*p*): And no Writers of this or the next Age do mention this pretended ſubmiſſion of *John* of *Conſtantinople*; *Marcellinus*, *Caſſiodorus*, *Euagrius* and *Paulus Diaconus* are wholly ſilent in this matter: And if we conſider how the Scene is dreſſed up with variety of Letters, (lately found out) we ſhall be tempted to think this part of the Epiſtles are forged; yet we may allow what *Baronius* ſaith, *that this abundance of Letters may make us that read them now, know more of this caſe, than they who lived in that Age knew, if they never ſaw theſe Letters* (q). For 'tis probable neither *Hormiſda*, nor his Legates, nor *Juſtin*, *Juſtinian*, *&c.* did ever ſee theſe Epiſtles that now appear under their names, ſo that we may very well know more than they did; but the reaſon is only, becauſe we know more than is true.

(m) *Baron. An.* 520. n. 35, 36. pag. 62.
(n) Idem 520. n. 56. pag. 66.
(o) Id. *An.* 521. n. 6. pag. 72.
(p) *Victor Tuen.* Chron. pag. 7. *Valer. & Juſt.* Coſſ. *An.* 521.
(q) *Baron. An.* 519. n. 27. & pag. 27.

We may diſcover ſome marks of Forgery in divers of theſe Papers; As that moſt of them want the Conſuls Names, and are not dated; That *Germanus* ſays, *he was received in Proceſſion with Wax Candles and Croſſes* (r); a Cuſtom of a later date; for we have no Croſſes in another Proceſſion deſcribed by a Writer of that time (*s*). The calling *Hormiſda* in one of the Letters, *Arch-Biſhop of the Univerſal Church* (t); and the Emperors giving the Popes Legate the Title of *His Angel* (u); Theſe, with many other things that might be obſerved, make it probable theſe Papers were Invented for a Pattern to the poor Greeks, when the deſign of ſubjecting

(r) *Baron. An.* 519. n. 35. pag. 29.
(s) Id. *An.* 522. n. 14. pag. 83.
(t) Ep. *Anaſtaſ. Bin.* pag. 589. col. 1. *Lab.* 1494.
(u) Ib. *Lab.* 1516 *Bin.* pag. 598. col. 1.

them to the Latin Church, was on foot in later Ages.

§.4. To proceed: Whereas *Juſtinian* in one particular point deſires the Opinion of *Hormiſda*, and complements him ſo far as to tell him, *He will believe that to be Orthodox, which he ſhall anſwer* (w); *Baronius* prints this in great Letters, and *Binius* from this particular Aſſertion draws a general Inference in his Margen, *viz. That which is defined by the Pope, is to be received by all for the Catholick Faith.* A Conſequence ſo abſurd, that *Labbè* is aſhamed of it and leaves it out, as well he might, ſince *Juſtinian* did not agree with the Pope in this Queſtion, after he had received his Anſwer. And the diſſenting Eaſtern Biſhops, at this time reckoned *Hormiſda* to be a Neſtorian (x), if we can credit any of theſe Papers. So that doubtleſs *Juſtinian* never thought a Pope Infallible.

(w) Ep *Juſtin.* ap. *Baron. An.* 519. n. 100. pag 43. *Bin.* p. 598. col. 2. *Lab.* 1517.

(x) Sug. *Germ. Bin.* pag. 597. col. 2. *Lab.* 1514.

In another Epiſtle aſcribed to *John* of *Conſtantinople*, not ſo very truckling as the former, that Biſhop is made to ſay, *by the help of the Interceſſion of the Holy and Conſubſtantial Trinity, and of the glorious and true Mother of God* (y). A Phraſe too abſurd for any Biſhop to uſe: For with whom ſhould the Trinity intercede, or what can be more ridiculous than equalling the Virgins Interceſſion to the Trinity, unleſs it be the making the Trinity pray to it ſelf? *Labbè* boldly attempts to mend this Sentence, but without Authority; and after all, its evidently writ by a later Hand.

(y) Relat. *Joh. Conſtant. Bin.* pag. 600. col. 2. *Lab.* 1521.

If the next relation of *Germanus* be true, it appears, No cauſe of a Biſhop of the Eaſt could be tried at *Rome*, without the conſent of the Emperor, who expreſly forbids the trying the Cauſe of *Dorotheus* at *Rome*, though the Pope earneſtly deſired it might be judged there (z), as *Baronius* alſo confeſſeth (a).

(z) Sug. *Germ. Bin.* pag 600. col. 2. *Lab.* 1522.

(a) *Baron. An.* 519. n. 142. pag. 52.

By the relation from the Synod at *Conſtantinople* it appears, that they call their new elected Patriarch *Epiphanius, The Popes own Brother, and fellow Miniſter; and count their joynt endeavours, to be one Brothers helping another*

ther (b). *Binius* ſtrives to blunder this by printing it, *Germanum veſtrum*, as if it were the proper name of the Popes Legate. But *Labbè* honeſtly reſtores the true reading *germanum veſtrum*.

(b) Relat. Synod. *Conſt. Bin.* pag. 601. col. 2. *Lab.* 1524.

The Epiſtle next to this bears the name of *Juſtinianus Auguſtus*; yet is dated *Anno* 520 (c), which is a groſs miſtake; for he was not ſtyled *Auguſtus* till near ſeven year after, as *Baronius* owns *Anno* 527. Yea, after this *Juſtinian* is ſtyled *Vir illuſtris* (d); and for certain was not Emperor when this Letter is ſaid to be writ.

(c) Epiſt. *Juſtin. Bin.* pag. 602. c. 1. *Lab.* 1526.

(d) *Bin.* pag. 606. *Lab.* 1536.

The Notes after *Hormiſda*'s 70*th* Epiſtle, do bitterly inveigh againſt *Johannes Maxentius*, and the Scythian Monks, as notorious Lyers, and Eutychian Hereticks; and *Labbè* is more ſevere in his Cenſure than *Binius* or *Baronius* (e). But they are all miſtaken; For this *Maxentius* was entirely Orthodox, and defended the Council of *Chalcedon* againſt the Eutychians, as is fully proved by two learned and judicious Writers, Biſhop *Uſher* and *Forbeſius* (f). And we may be ſure *Baronius* firſt invented this falſe accuſation, (thinking it impoſſible any Man but a Heretick could write againſt the Pope), to be revenged on *Maxentius* for ſo bold a Fact. But in the Age before, *Cochlæus* a Papiſt or Catholick (as *Baronius* calls him) did honeſtly put out *Maxentius* his Works, as an Orthodox Writer, though *Maxentius* do write againſt the Epiſtle under *Hormiſda*'s Name, to *Poſſeſſor* an African Biſhop; and proves whoever was the Author of that Epiſtle, was a Lyer and an Heretick, as were alſo *Poſſeſſor* and *Dioſcorus*, one of the Popes Legates; and he further juſtifies himſelf, and the Scythian Monks, blaming the Pope for baniſhing them from *Rome:* Saying amongſt other thing, *If the Biſhop of* Rome *ſhould prohibit us to confeſs Chriſt, the Son, to be one of the Holy and undivided Trinity, the Church would never yield to him, nor reſpect him as an Orthodox Biſhop, but utterly Accurſe him as an Heretick* (g). So that no body then believed the Pope to be Infallible; and for *Hormiſda*, *Maxentius* ſuſpects him to be a favourer of Pelagianiſm. The Emperor *Juſtin* ſpeaking of the Church

(e) Ep. 70. *Horm. Bin.* pag. 605. col. 1. *Lab.* 1532. *Baron. An.* 519. n. 101. pag. 43.

(f) *Uſher.* Antiq. *Britan.* cap. 14. pag. 256. *Forbeſ.* Inſtruct. Theolog. lib. 3. cap. 21.

(g) Open. *Max.* edit. *Cochlæi*, fol. 31.

Church of *Hieruſalem*, ſaith, *that all men ſhew* [tantum favorem, the Editors read *tamen*, only to blunder the Period] *ſo much favour to it, as to the Mother of the Chriſtian Name, that none dare ſeparate from it* (h). Had this been ſaid of *Rome*, how would the Paraſites have Triumphed? Yet wanting real Encomiums, in the next Paper they ſteal one; and where the Eaſtern Clergy ſpeak of their own Churches which *had not ſwerved from the Faith delivered to them*; The Editors apply this to *Rome*, and ſay in the Margen (*i*), *The Roman Church never deviated from right Doctrin:* But the Reader will find there is no mention of the Roman Church in that place; only S. *Peter*, who founded that of *Antioch*, is pointed at a little before.

(h) Epiſt. *Juſtin. Bin* pag. 608. col. 2. *Lab.* 1542.

(i) *Bin.* p. 609. col. 1. *Lab.* 1543.

Before *Hormiſda*'s 77*th* Epiſtle there is one of *Juſtinian*, to *Hormiſda*; wherein he declares, that after the Controverſie was ſetled *ultra non patiemur* (they blunder it by reading *nos patiemur*) *He will not ſuffer any one under that Government to ſtir any more in it* (k): Which is a brisk Order to the Pope, in a cauſe of Religion. For which reaſon, and becauſe it ſhews, that he and the Greeks would not yield to leave out any Name, but that of *Acacius*, *Baronius* omits it, and only prints the anſwer to it (*l*): For this was writ the year after the pretended conſent of the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, to raſe out *Euthymius*, and *Macedonius*, with other Names out of the Dypticks.

(k) Ep. *Juſtin. Bin.* pag. 611. col. 1. *Lab.* 1547.

(l) *Baron. An.* 520. n. 4. p. 55. Tom. vii.

We cannot leave this Pope without ſome remarks on his carriage in anſwer to the Queſtion propounded to him by *Juſtinian*, viz. *Whether it were Orthodox to ſay* (as the Scythian Monks did) *one of the Trinity was crucified for us?* *Dioſcorus* the Popes Legate repreſented this Sentence to *Hormiſda*, as Heretical, and that to allow it would open a gap to many Hereſies (*m*). The Pope firſt determined to refer the controverſie to the Biſhop, of *Conſtantinople*, as appears by another relation of *Dioſcorus* (n); though *Baronius* would conceal this, by omitting the beginning of this Paper (*o*). But probably *Dioſcorus* durſt not truſt this Queſtion with the Patriarch of *Con-*

(m) *Baron. An.* 519. n. 82, 83. pag. 39.

(n) *Bin.* p. 599. col. 2.

(o) *Baron. An.* 519. n. 124. pag. 48.

Conſtantinople. So that *Hormiſda* not yet declaring himſelf, *Juſtinian* writ to him, that he and the Eaſtern Church thought this Sentence Orthodox, and required his conſent to their Faith (*p*), which he further ſhews in another Epiſtle complaining of the Popes delays (*q*). At laſt, after a long time *Hormiſda* writes a ſhuffling Letter to the Emperor, wherein *Baronius* ſaith he utterly exploded this Sentence (*r*): Yea, *Baronius* owns afterward, that this Pope would have all Catholicks abhor theſe words; *One of the Trinity ſuffered in the Fleſh* (s). But this very Sentence afterward appeared to be True and Orthodox, and they who condemned it were declared Hereticks. Yea, the Scythian Monks appealed from this Pope to that moſt learned and orthodox Father *Fulgentius*, who declared they were in the right, and that he believed as they did (*t*). And finally, one of the ſucceeding Popes joyned with *Juſtinian* and the Orthodox Chriſtians to confirm this Sentence: So that this Pope and his Legate were both on the Heretical ſide, which ſpoils the Infallibility.

(*p*) Id. *An.* 520 n. 37. pag. 62.
(q) Ep. *Juſtin. Bin.* pag. 610. Col. 2.
(r) *Baron. An.* 521. n. 26, 27. pag. 77.
(s) *Baron. An.* 533. n. 4. pag. 179.
(*t*) Vid. opera *Fulg.* ep. ad Monach. col. 272.

§. 5. The Councils abroad in this Popes times take no notice of him, yet bear the Title of being held under him: The firſt, (*Binius* ſays) was at *Rhemes*, and he cites for this *Flodoardus* (u). But *Labbè* calls this a Synod at an uncertain place, and gives us *Binius* his Notes; but cites the words of *Flodoardus*; by which it appears that *Rhemigius* his being made the Popes Legate, and calling this Synod there by a Legantine power, are Fictions of *Baronius* and *Binius*, taken out of the firſt forged Epiſtle of *Hormiſda*, and falſly charged upon *Flodoardus*, who ſaith no ſuch thing: And *Sirmondus* with *P. de Marca* ſay, *Rhemigius* was not the Popes Legate: Which manifeſtly appears from two Epiſtles of his, writ ten year after this feigned delegation (*w*), concerning an Invaſion made upon his juriſdiction, wherein he never urges any ſort of power as Legate, but pleads his original right as a Metropolitan: And from *Baronius* and his Plagiary citing *Flodoardus*

An. Dom. 514.
(u) Conc. *Rhem. Bin* pag. 614. col 2. *Lab.* 1572.
(*w*) Ep. *Rhem. Lab.* col. 1608. *An.* 524.

doardus at large for this, compared with the words of that Author in *Labbè*; the Reader may learn, theſe Writers are never to be truſted in any Quotation relating to the Pope, till the Authors be ſearched.

An. Dom. 516. (x) Concil. Tarrac. *Bin.* pag. 615. *Lab* 1562. (y) Not. *Bin.* pag 617. *Lab.* 1566.

The Council of *Tarragon* was not under *Hormiſda*, though it were in his time (x); The Biſhops there acting independently on *Rome*, whoſe Popes Decrees of dividing the Church Revenues into four parts, they contradict, and divide it only into three (y) in the eighth Canon: And in the eleventh, they order concerning the Diſcipline of Monks, the Gallican Canons ſhall above all others be obſerved.

An. Dom. 517.

Binius miſplaces the Council of *Pau*, *Anno Dom.* 509. But *Labbè* ſets it in this year rightly; it was called (not by the Pope, but) by *Sigiſmund* King of *Burgundy*, as all Provincial and National Synods in that age were; the famous *Alcimus Avitus* was Preſident of it, and the Pope had no hand in it; for which reaſon theſe leſſer Councils are more ſincere than any, where *Rome* or the Pope is named, for there the Forgers are always tempted to leave, add, or alter ſomething.

(a) See theſe Notes on Ep. 24. *Horm.* (b) Concil. Gerund. *Bin.* pag. 618, &c. *Lab.* 1567.

The ſame year was a Council held at *Gyrone* in *Spain*, not under the Pope, but under *John* of *Tarragon*; and though by *Hormiſda*'s forged Epiſtles, he be pretended to have been the Pope's Legate (a), and that he received Conſtitutions from *Rome*, it is plain this Council proceeds upon its own Authority (b), and makes its own Rules; which ſhews theſe Fictions are of a later date.

An. Dom. 518. (c) Concil. Conſt. *Bin.* pag. 620. col. 1. *Lab.* 1586. (d) *Bin.* p. 725. Col. 2. *Lab.* Tom. 5 p. 162.

The Council of *Conſtantinople* is falſly titled under *Hormiſda*; the Union was not yet made, and *Hormiſda* ſent not his Legates till next year, ſo that it is very trifling for the Editors to ſay, it was *partly reprobated at Rome* (c), becauſe this Synod conſiſted only of Eaſtern Biſhops, called by *Juſtin* the Emperor; and their own Patriarch *John* of *Conſtantinople* preſided, whom they call, *Moſt Holy and Bleſſed Father of Fathers, Archbiſhop and Oecumenical Patriarch* (d), and of him and *Juſtin*, only do they deſire their Acts to be confirmed. And not

not only they, but two Eaſtern Synods alſo at *Jeruſalem* and *Tyre* ratified theſe Decrees, which gave them a ſufficient Authority; and it is but a Roman Fiction, that theſe Acts were revoked upon the reconciling of the Eaſtern and Weſtrn Churches.

§. 6. *John* the firſt ſucceeded *Hormiſda*, probably by the intereſt of *Theodoric* the Arrian Gothick King, for he commanded him to go as his Embaſſador to the Eaſtern Emperor *Juſtin*, to require him not to perſecute the Arrians, but reſtore to them their Churches which he had taken away, Threatning he would uſe the Catholicks of *Italy* ſeverely, if this were not granted (*e*). The Pontifical ſoftens this with a gentle phraſe, *Rogans miſit* —as if *Theodoric* entreated the Pope to go on this ungrateful Errant; but the Notes more truly affirm, *he forced him to take this Office* (*f*). However, the Pope durſt not diſobey that King, wherefore he went to *Conſtantinople*, and did deliver this requeſt to *Juſtin*, ſo as to prevail for liberty to the Arrians in the Eaſt, as all Authors (before *Baronius*) affirm (*g*): But the Cardinal calls this *a baſe blot of the Popes prevarication*; and therefore he with the Notes give *Anaſtaſius* the lye, and forſake him in this part of *John*'s Story whom in all the reſt they follow. For *Baronius* will not allow, that a Pope ſhould do ſo vile a thing, as to ſollicit for Liberty of Conſcience for Arrian Hereticks; wherefore he pretends he encouraged *Juſtin* to go on in puniſhing them: But they cannot prove this, except by a forged Epiſtle writ in this Popes name, and a miſtaken paſſage out of *Gregory* of *Tours*, who knew not the true Story, but ſpeaks of *John*'s Embaſſy to *Theodoric*, inſtead of *Juſtin*. One Argument only *Baronius* urges, which is, *Why* Theodoric *ſhould impriſon this Pope at his return, and keep him priſoner till he dyed in that woful confinement, if he had faithfully diſcharged his Embaſſy* (*b*). I anſwer from *Paulus Diaconus*, *That* Theodoric *was moved to anger, becauſe* Juſtin *the Catholick Emperor had received him ſo honourably* (*i*); and alſo as *Baronius* himſelf ſaith,

An Dom. 523.

(*e*) Vit. *Johan.* *Bin.* pag. 621. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1600.

(*f*) Not. *Bin.* 622. *Lab.* 1602.

(*g*) *Anaſtaſius* ut ſup. *Platina* pag 71. *Naucler.* Chron. pag. 702 *Paul. Diacenus* l. 17. pag. 166, & 167.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 525. n. 8. pag. 106, & 107.

(*i*) *Pet. Diacon.* l. 17. pag. 167.

This Gothick King ſuſpected the Romans were then laying Plots againſt him, and confederating with Juſtin *the Emperor.* So that doubtleſs he thought the Pope was in this deſign, and ſo ſuffered him to dye in Priſon: Now all this proves, that theſe Gothick Kings were abſolute Lords over the Biſhops of *Rome*; and it looks like a Judgment on the Roman See, that whereas they had been ſo bitter againſt *Acacius* and other Orthodox Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, for only converſing with ſuppoſed Hereticks, one of their own Popes was forced to plead that the worſt of all Hereticks, the Arrians, might have the publick exerciſe of their Religion allowed by Law. I take no notice of the Miracles aſcribed to this Pope, becauſe the fabulous Gregorian Dialogues are the only Evidence for them.

The Roman Mint hath Coined two Epiſtles for this Pope, of which *Labbè* ſaith, *many things prove that they are both forged* (*k*). The firſt is patched up out of the fragments of many other Popes Letters; and that paſſage of *the Sheeps reproving their Paſtor, if he Err in the Faith*, is originally ſtollen out of a feigned Epiſtle under Pope *Fabian*'s name. *Baronius* and *Binius* both confeſs a falſe date, *viz. Olybrius* and *Maximus* being Conſuls, who were never in office together; and if we read *Id. Junij Maximo Conſule*, *John* was not made Pope till two Months after, nor will *Olybrio Conſule*, mend the matter with *Id. Junij*, becauſe this Pope dyed the 27*th* of *May* in that year: However, though they cannot reconcile theſe Errors, the Notes and *Baronius* would have this Forgery paſs for genuine, to clear the Pope from ſerving the Arrian intereſt (*l*). The ſecond Epiſtle is alſo Fictitious, being a Rhapſody out of *Leo*'s Epiſtles and ſome places of Scripture (*m*), and dated after this Pope was dead: So that we muſt reject them both together, with the Legend of his Conſecrating Arrian Churches for the Orthodox, in defiance to King *Theodoric*, which *Baronius* and *Binius* would have us believe.

(*k*) Ep. 1. *Joban. Bin.* pag. 623. col. 1. *Lab.* 1603.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 526. n. 3. pag. 111.

(*m*) Ep. 2. *Joban Bin.* pag. 526. col. 2. *Lab.* 1605.

The

The Council of *Lerida* in *Spain*, was not as *Binius* faith, *under* John, but *under* Sergius *Biſhop of* Tarragon *who preſided in it*, and in the 16 Canon, is called *the Biſhop of the firſt See*; a Title common to all Primates of old, but lately engroſſed by the Pope (*n*). In the Fragments of this Council, there is a method of canonically purging Clerks accuſed of Crimes; but it cannot belong to this Council (as *Labbè* owns,) becauſe it mentions *Leo* the Third and *Charlemaign*, who lived near 300 year after this Synod was held (*o*). In the ſame year was another Spaniſh Council at *Valencia*, in Pope *John*'s time, but he is not once named in it, and the Canons were made by the Biſhops of the Province (*p*): Wherefore, *Binius* falſly Titles it *under Pope* John.

An. Dom. 524.

(*n*) Concil. Ilerd. *Bin* pag. 625. col. 1. *Lab.* 1610.

(*o*) *Lab.* in Marg col. 1615.

(*p*) Concil. Valent. *Bin.* pag. 629. *Lab.* 1617.

The ſame year was held the Council of *Arles*, which *Binius* miſcalls the third, but was truly the fourth Council there. This Synod was placed wrong formerly *An.* 453, when one *Opilio* was Conſul with *Vincomalus*; but another *Opilio* was Conſul with *Ruſticus* this year *An.* 524, and *Cæſarius* his Subſcription to it ſhews, this is the true date of it (*q*). *Binius* is here twice miſtaken. Firſt, In his old Title of *ſub Johanne*. Secondly, In printing the Epiſtle of *Fauſtus* in this place, as if this Council of *Arles* were that which *Fauſtus* pretended confirmed his Pelagian Errors: But *Labbè* ſaith, *Binius is miſtaken*, and 'tis certain he was quite out.

(*q*) Concil. Arel. 4. *Bin.* pag. 631. col. 2. *Lab.* 1622, &c.

In *Labbè*, we have here a ſingular Example of the modeſty of *Fulgentius*, who was very juſtly choſen Preſident of an African Synod: But perceiving a certain Biſhop took this ill, in the next Council he renounced the Seat and Dignity, procuring that Biſhop to ſit before him, *reſolving not to defend the Primacy he deſerved* (ſaith the Author,) *where it would make a breach of Charity* (*r*). And oh how happy had Chriſtendom been, if the Popes had followed this Pattern! Who at this time had renounced the Communion of more than half the Chriſtian World, chiefly for not ſubmit-

(*r*) *Lab.* 1628. *Baron. An.* 523. n. 32. pag. 103.

ſubmitting to their Primacy, and in every Age ſince, have Quarrelled with all that would not allow them that claim.

The Council of *Carthage* under *Boniface* Biſhop there, Stiles him *Biſhop of the firſt See* (*s*): It never names the Pope, and makes it very clear, that this Primate did order all things in that Province, without any dependance on *Rome*.

(*s*) *Lab.* Col. 1629.

An. Dom. 526. §. 7. *Fœlix* the Fourth was named by King *Theodoric*, who being now Lord of *Rome*, did of right propoſe him to the Clergy as a Candidate for the Papacy, void by *Johns* death (*t*). The Notes pretend this was an uſurpation, and *Baronius* for this Rails bitterly at *Theodoric*; calling it *an arrogant Fact*, and giving him the Title *of a cruel Barbarian, a dreadful Tyrant and impious Arrian, adding that this was the cauſe of Gods deſtroying him* (*u*). But for all this rage, this is no more than what all Princes then did in their own Dominions: And theſe Editors a little before printed an Epiſtle wherein it is ſaid, *That* Epiphanius *was made Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *by the Election of* Juſtin *and the Empreſs, with the conſent of the Nobles, Prieſts and People* (*w*): *And* Hormiſda *in the 76th Epiſtle ſaith he was rightly elected*: Which ſhews, that the Eaſtern Emperors did not learn this of the Gothick Kings; but theſe learned of the Emperors to name the Biſhops of their chief Cities (*x*). And *Theodoric* ever exerciſed this Right, as the caſe of *Symmachus* ſhewed us before: Wherefore that Law of *Ordoacer*, that the Pope ſhould be elected by the Princes conſent, remained ſtill in force; and *Symmachus* his pretended Repeal of it is either forged, or elſe theſe Kings deſpiſed all Papal Councils which abridged them of their right.

(*t*) Vit. *Fœl.* 4. *Bin.* p. 634. col. 2. *Lab.* 1649.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 526. n. 22 & 25. pag. 116, 117.

(*w*) Relat. Ep. *Bin.* pag 605. col. 2. *Lab.* 1537.

(*x*) *Baron.* ut ſup. pag. 116.

In the Notes on this Popes Life, we have a fabulous Viſion of ſome doting Hermit, who fancied he ſaw *Theodoric*'s Soul thrown into the Vulcanian Kettles (*y*). This out of *Gregory*'s Dialogues is Foundation enough for them to Triumph in his Damnation, who reſolve to

(*y*) Not. in vitam *Fœlic. Bin.* pag. 634, 635. *Lab.* 1650.

to find out ſome Viſion or Dream to perſwade eaſie Readers, that all Princes who injured any Pope were ſent to Eternal Flames: Again, the Notes pretend, that *Juſtinian*'s Eccleſiaſtical Laws were made by the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, and put out in that Emperors name: But why might not *Juſtinian* make his own Laws about Church matters, as *Conſtantine* and all his Succeſſors to this time had done? No doubt he and they uſed in ſuch caſes to adviſe with their own Biſhops: But theſe Paraſites of *Rome* are angry, that the Pope is not the ſole Law-maker in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical; now he was not ſo much as conſulted in theſe Laws, being then the Subject of another Prince: And what they object of *Juſtinian*'s ſpeaking honourably of *Zeno* and *Anaſtaſius* his Predeceſſors (Enemies to *Rome*) confirms me in the Opinion, that *Juſtinian* in compoſing theſe Laws took no advice from St. *Peter*'s Chair.

We may juſtly ſuſpect moſt of theſe Papal Epiſtles, (out of which the Canoniſts for ſome Ages fetcht thoſe Rules, by which they oppreſſed the Chriſtian World,) becauſe if a Pope neither did nor writ any thing remarkable, the Forgers invented Buſineſs and Letters for him as they have done for Pope *John* and this *Fœlix*; whoſe two firſt Epiſtles *Labbè* declares to be ſpurious (*z*), and ſhews the former is made up out of the Forgeries in Pope *Eleutherius* name, as alſo out of the Epiſtles of *Leo*, and *Gregory* who was yet unborn; the latter ſteals the beginning from an Epiſtle of Pope *Innocent*'s, and the reſt is *verbatim* taken out of a ſpurious Epiſtle aſcribed to Pope *Dionyſius* (*a*): And the date of this alſo is after *Fœlix* his death. But *Binius* boldly ſaith they are genuine; and *Baronius* would perſuade us, the name of *Fœlix* was put for *Boniface*, (which is an unlikely change) (*b*). Now if you ask why they vindicate ſuch Traſh; I muſt Note, it is for the ſake of one dear Sentence, *viz.* That *the Roman Church in one of them is twice called the Head*; A phraſe which is enough to make any Coin currant at *Rome*.

(*z*) Ep. 1. *Fœl. Bin.* pag. 635. col. 1. *Lab.* 1650. Et Ep. 2. *Bin.* pag. 673. col. 1. *Lab.* 1656.

(*a*) Vid. *Bin.* Tom. 1. pag. 158.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 530. n. 1. pag. 153.

The

The Third Epiſtle was dated 15 year before *Felix* was Pope (*c*), till *Sirmondus* lately mended the Conſuls name; 'tis ſaid to be written to *Cæſarius* Biſhop of *Arles*, who is here ſtiled not the *Son*, but the *Brother of the Pope:* But the matter of it is ſuch mean ſtuff, that the true Author will have no credit by it, nor is it material whether it be genuine or no: And by the way 'tis ſomewhat odd, that theſe forged or trifling Epiſtles, ſhould give *Du-Pin* ground for putting theſe two Popes into his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers (*d*).

(*c*) Ep. 3. *Felix. Bin.* pag. 637. col. 1. *Lab.* 1657.

(*d*) *Du-Pin* Hiſt. Cent. 6. pag. 29.

Labbè adds here a Form of Anathematizing the Manichæan Hereſie, wherein St. *Auguſtin*'s Opinion guides the Affair (*e*). The Pope is not concerned in reconciling Hereticks; for the Authority of *Rome* was not ſo conſiderable in thoſe days, as theſe Men pretend.

(*e*) *Lab.* col. 1658.

An. Dom. 529. 'Tis true, the Council of *Orange* owns they had ſome Capitulars ſent from *Rome* againſt the Pelagians (*f*). But *Labbè*'s Notes ſay, they were Sentences collected out of the Fathers, eſpecially St. *Auguſtin*, and agreeable to holy Scripture (*g*). Wherefore *Binius* falſly brags, that this Controverſie was determined by the Popes Authority; it was determined by St. *Auguſtin*'s Authority, whoſe Doctrin Pope *John* the ſecond ſaith, *the Roman Church then kept and followed* (*h*). *Rome* only furniſhed the Records toward it; and a Clerk of the Rolls may as well be called the Determiner and Judge of a Suit where he produces any old writing, as the Pope made Arbiter in this Caſe: And it was the Gallican Synods Decree, which made theſe Definitions to be of Force in *France*. *Sirmondus* indeed pretends, Pope *Boniface* confirmed this Council (*i*); but acknowledges the confirmation came ſome time after, though the modern Paraſites had falſly placed this Papal confirmation before the Council: But if we enquire more ſtrictly, it will appear this ſecond Epiſtle of *Boniface* the Second, (which is the confirmation) is Forged; for it not only bears date the year after the Council, but (as

(*f*) Concil *Araus.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 638. col. 1. *Lab.* 1666.

(*g*) *Lab.* not. col. 1676.

(*h*) Ep. 3. *Joan.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 655. col. 1. *Lab.* 1751.

(*i*) *Lab.* col. 1673.

(as *Sirmondus* owns (*k*),) it is dated ſeven Months before *Boniface* was Pope: So that unleſs you will allow him to alter Dates at his pleaſure, this Pope did not confirm this Synod at all: Only any thing muſt be genuine with theſe Men, which gives countenance to the Papal uſurpations.

(*k*) Not. *Sirmond. Lab.* col. 1689.

The Notes upon this Council cite a Teſtimony out of *Gennadius*, *that Pope* Fœlix *approved a Book writ by* Cæſarius *againſt the Pelagians* (*l*): Which Teſtimony is not in my Edition of *Gennadius*; and if that Author have writ any ſuch thing, he muſt mean *Fœlix* the Third, becauſe he writ *An.* 492, which is above 30 year before this *Fœlix* was Pope. But when ſuch learned Men as *Proſper* and *Cæſarius* writ againſt an Hereſie, the Popes *Celeſtine* and *Fœlix* gladly ſubſcribed them, not to give the Books any greater Authority, but to prove themſelves Orthodox, and in Communion with men ſo famous for defending the Catholick Faith.

(*l*) Not. ap. *Bin.* pag. 641. col. 1. *Lab.* 1676.

The Second or Third Council of *Vaiſon*, was falſly placed by *Binius under Pope* John *the ſecond*, *who was not Pope till two years after* (*m*); But *Sirmondus* rightly places it in this year in *Fœlix* his time. In the firſt Canon it would have appeared plainly, that the Readers then had Wives allowed, if the true reading had ſtood, which muſt be *Lectores—ſuas uxores habentes—recipiant.* But the Forgers have altered it in *Binius* thus, *—ſive uxores habuerint*; in *Labbè* thus, *ſine uxore*, *&c.* But the corrupters in both Editions have left this paſſage ſo abuſed, that it is neither Grammar nor Senſe. The fourth Canon is double in *Binius*; *Labbè* hath made it but one; it orders *That the Popes name ſhall be recited in the Gallican Offices.* Now to make this Canon ſeem more ancient, the Paraſites had hoiſted up this Council 200 year, even as high as Pope *Julius*, where *Binius* ſhameleſly prints it: But *Sirmondus* proves there could be no ſuch French Council at that time: And conſidering the Forgers have been ſo buſie with this Canon, I judge it very probable, that it was made by a Council much later than this Age, only it is clapt in here

An. Dom. 529.

(*m*) Concil. Vaſ. 3. *Bin.* pag. 641. *Lab.* 1679.

here very abruptly, to ſupport an earlier Grandeur than the Popes at the time enjoyed; I am ſure it ſeems unlikely, the Gallican Church ſhould then pay this great reſpect to *Rome*.

An. Dom. 530. §. 8. Pope *Boniface* the Second ſucceeded *Fælix*, but not by a clear Election, for another party choſe *Dioſcorus* who had been Legate to *Horſmida* (*n*); but he was either poyſoned or died naturally, within a Month, and ſo *Boniface* kept the Chair: His Malice however died not with his Rival: For he called a Synod, and got him anathematized after his Death for *Simony*: Which crime Pope *Agapetus* a little after proved to be falſe, and the Sentence extorted from the Clergy by Boniface's *malicious craft*; So that the Sentence was revoked, and *Dioſcorus* with his party abſolved (*o*). Another Evidence of this Popes raſhneſs was a Decree made alſo in this Synod, *That the Pope ſhould name his Succeſſor*, which was not only againſt the Canons, (which this Pope and his Council here had violated,) but againſt an expreſs Law of the Gothick Princes; and therefore when this fallible Pope ſaw his Error, a little after he called another Synod and revoked this Decree, confeſſing himſelf, as *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, *Guilty of Treaſon*, in making the former Order; by which we may ſee, in that Age it was Treaſon for the Pope in Council to Repeal a Royal Law. Wherefore I wonder that *Baronius* ſhould call that *the wreſting a preſumtuous and uſurped power out of the Goths hands* (*p*), which his poor Maſter owned to be Treaſon. In ſhort this Pope is only famous for his Errors and evil Deeds.

(*n*) Vit. *Bonif.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 643. col. 2. *Lab.* 1682.

(*o*) Vita *Agapet. Bin.* pag. 664. col. 1. *Lab.* 1785.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 531. pag. 165. n. 1, 2.

But to make him look great, the Forgers have invented an Epiſtle for him, containing many vaunts of the Roman Churches greatneſs, and a pretended ſubmiſſion of the Church of *Carthage*, after a very long ſeparation from *Rome*, even from the time of *Aurelius* (*q*). Now though this came out of their own Shop, it is ſo groſs an untruth in the main, That *Binius* and all their later Writers reject it: But though I think

(*q*) Ep. 1. *Bonif.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 644. col. 1. *Lab.* 1683.

think the Epiſtle certainly Spurious, and this ſubmiſſion forged; yet it is true, the African Churches (even while they did own the Roman for an Orthodox Church,) had for a long time denied that uſurped juriſdiction of Appeals from thence to *Rome*, to which ſome Popes pretended, which had made them ſtand at a diſtance from the See of *Rome*: The Notes on this Epiſtle have a fallacious Argument however, to prove the African Church could not ſo long remain divided from the Roman; becauſe if ſo, they could have no true Martyrs all that time, ſince the Fathers agree, *That Crown is only due to thoſe who ſuffer in the Catholick Church* (r). I reply, this may be very true; and yet ſince no Father ever ſaid that the particular Roman Church is the Catholick Church, a Chriſtian may dye a true Martyr if he die in the Communion of the Catholick Church, though he hold no Communion with the Roman Church, which was the caſe at this time, or lately, of many Eaſtern Churches.

(r) Not. in Ep. 1. *Bin.* pag. 645. Col. 1. *Lab.* 1686.

Another Forgery out of the ſame Mint treads on the heels of this, pretending to be a Copy of the Emperor *Juſtin*, and *Juſtinian*'s ſubmiſſion to this Pope; wherein they are made to own the Supremacy of *Rome* to the higheſt pitch, and to Curſe all their Predeceſſors and Succeſſors, who did not maintain that Churches Priviledges (s). But the cheat is ſo apparent, the matter ſo improbable and ridiculous, and the date ſo abſurd, that *Baronius* and both the Editors reject it; So that I ſhall only note, that a true Doctrine could not need ſo many Forgeries to ſupport it, and the intereſt they ſerve ſhews who employed theſe Forgers.

(s) Exemplar prec. *Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* ibid. *Baron. An.* 530. n. 6. pag. 154.

We have ſpoken before of *Boniface*'s two Roman Councils, one of them revoking what the other decreed: The third is only in *Labbè*, being a glorious Pageant, dreſt up by the ſuſpicious hand of a late Library-keeper to the Pope. But it amounts to no more than the introducing a poor Greek Biſhop or two, to enquire what was ſaid in the Roman Records, and in the Popes Letters of the Authority of that Church (t).

(t) Concil. Rom. 3. *Bonif. Lab.* 1691.

So that the Pope and his Council were Judges and Witneſſes in their own Cauſe, and therefore their Evidence is of no great Credit: And 'tis very ominous, that this Synod is dated in *December*, that is, two Months after *Boniface*'s death, who is ſaid to have been preſent at all its Seſſions (*u*). To cover which evident mark of Forgery, *Holſtenius* gives *Baronius* and all other Writers the Lye, about the time of *Boniface*'s dying, and keeps him alive ſome time longer only to give colour to this new-found Synod.

(*u*) Not. *Luc. Holſtein. Lab.* 1723.

An. Dom. 531. The Council of *Toledo* might be in *Boniface*'s time, but not *under him*: For the King of *Spain*, (whom the Biſhops here call *their Lord*) called it, and it was held *ſub Mantano* (ſaith *Baronius*) (*w*), under *Montanus* the Metropolitan, to whom the Council ſaith, *Cuſtom had given that Authority* (*x*): Wherefore he condemns Heretics, and exerciſes all ſorts of juriſdiction belonging to a Primate, without taking any notice of the Pope, or of any delegated Power from him. So that probably all thoſe Epiſtles which make Legates in *Spain* about this time, are forged.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 531. n. 12. pag. 167.

(*x*) Concil. Tol. 2. *Bin.* pag. 646. *Lab.* 1734.

An. Dom. 532. §. 9. *John* the ſecond of that Name ſucceeded *Boniface*, but *Anaſtaſius* and *Baronius* cannot agree about the Date of his Election or his Death; and *Holſtenius* differs from both; an Argument that this Pope made no great Figure (*y*): However, right or wrong we have divers of his Epiſtles.

(*y*) Vit. *Joan.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 650. Col. *Lab.* 1741.

The firſt to *Valerius* (ſaith *Labbè*) *appears by many things to be ſpurious*; it is ſtollen out of the Epiſtles of *Leo* and *Ithacius*, and dated with wrong Conſuls (*z*). And I muſt add, Scripture is ſhamefully perverted by the Writer of this Epiſtle; For he would prove that Chriſt was not created as to his Deity, but only as to his Humanity, by *Epheſ.* iv. 24. and *Coloſſ.* iii. 10. where St. *Paul* ſpeaks of *putting on the New Man, which after God is created in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs,——and is renewed in Knowledge after the Image of him that created him*: Had a Pope writ this, I would have affirmed he was no Infallible Interpreter.

(*z*) Ep. *Joh.* 2. *Bin.* 651. Col. 1 *Lab.* 1741.

The

The next is an Epiſtle of *Juſtinian* to this Pope, wherein the Emperor is pretended to declare his Faith was conformable in all things to the Roman Church; and made to ſay, *he had ſubjected and united all the Churches of the* Eaſt *to the Pope, who is the Head of all the Holy Churches*—— with much more ſtuff of this kind (*a*). This Letter is rejected by the learned *Hottoman*, and many other very great Lawyers, who *Baronius* calls *a company of Hereticks and Petty Foggers* (*b*); But confutes their Arguments with falſe Reaſoning and Forgeries, as I ſhall ſhew when I come to note his Errors: I ſhall now confine my ſelf to prove the greateſt part of this Epiſtle to be ſpurious: For who can imagin *Juſtinian* (who vindicated the Authority of his Patriarch at *Conſtantinople* as equal with *Rome*, and by an Authentick Law declares, *that the Church of* Conſtantinople *is the Head of all other Churches* (*c*): Yea, in the genuine part of this Epiſtle, calls his Patriarch *the Pope's Brother*) That he, I ſay, ſhould here profeſs he had ſubjected all the Eaſtern Churches to *Rome*? And how ſhould he (that differed from Pope *Hormiſda* in his deciſion of the Queſtion, *whether one Perſon of the Trinity ſuffered for us*; and made Pope *John* now yield to his Opinion, and condemn his Predeceſſors notion) declare he ſubmitted his Faith in all things to the Pope? But we need no conjectures, for if the Reader look a little further among the Epiſtles of *Agapetus* (*d*), he will ſee one of the boldeſt Impoſtures that ever was; For there *Juſtinian* himſelf recites *verbatim*, the Epiſtle which he had writ to Pope *John*, and whatever is more in this Letter ſet out among *John*'s Epiſtles, than there is in that which is owned by the Emperor, is an impudent Forgery, added by ſome falſe Corrupter to ſerve the Roman Supremacy: Now by comparing theſe two Epiſtles, it appears, *the beginning and end of both are the ſame, and may be genuine*; but in neither part is there one word of this ſubjection, or the univerſal Supremacy: And all that wretched Jargon comes in where it is corrupted, *viz.* From *Ideoq*; *omnes*

(*a*) Ep. *Juſtin.* ad *Joan.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 651. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1742.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 534. n. 15. pag. 197.

(*c*) *Juſtin.* Cod. lib. 1. tit. 2. de Sacroſ. Eccleſ. *Lab.* 24. pag. 10.

(*d*) Inter. Ep. *Agap. Bin.* pag. 666. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1789.

nes Sacerdotes univerſi orientalis tractus, & ſubjicere —— till you come to theſe words —— *Petimus ergo veſtrum paternum* ——: Which when the Reader hath well noted, he will admire, that thoſe who had the cunning to corrupt a Princes Letter, by adding twice as much to it as he writ, ſhould be ſo ſilly to print the true Letter, within a few Pages: But doubtleſs God infatuates ſuch Corrupters, and the Devil owes a ſhame to Lyers.

The next Epiſtle from the Gothic King *Athalaric*, was probably writ ſoon after *John*'s Election, ſince it mentions the Romans coming to that Prince, to beg leave to chuſe a Pope; and both *Athalaric* and the Senate made Laws to prevent *Simony* in the Election of the Pope, as well as other Biſhops: And which (*Baronius* ſaith,) *was more Ignominious, This Edict was Ingraven on a Marble Table, and hung up before the Court of St.* Peters *for all to ſee it* (e). But to me it ſeems more Ignominious, that the Letter ſhews ſome of the late Candidates for the Papacy had ſacrilegiouſly ſold the holy Veſſels to buy Voices (f): Theſe no doubt were like to make hopeful Heads of the Univerſal Church. *Baronius* is angry at this Letter and Edict, and I ſuppoſe places it falſly after the forged Epiſtle of *Juſtinian* had aggrandized this Pope; but do what he can, the Kings reckoning him among other Patriarchs, and making Laws for Papal Elections, and his giving him no huffing Titles, do clearly demonſtrate that Popes then were not ſo great as our Annaliſt would make them ſeem; and I wonder with what face he can ſay, *This Law was not againſt the Clergy but the Lay-men*, When the Law it ſelf, and the occaſion of it confutes him.

(e) *Baron. An.* 533. n. 39. pag. 188.

(f) Ep. *Athal. Bin.* pag. 653. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1478.

The Third Epiſtle may be genuine, wherein he doth well to ſay, that *according to the Decrees of his Predeceſſors, the Roman Church ever kept and followed the Doctrin of St.* Auguſtin (g); and if they had never followed any other Guide, there would not have been ſo many falſe Doctrins brought in to that Church: Howe-

(g) Epiſt. 3. *Johan.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 655. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1752.

However, the great impertinence of divers Scriptures here cited ſhews this Pope to be no great Divine, and one of his proofs I doubt is forged; for I cannot, in *Exod.* xxiv. or any other place find theſe words, *You ſhall ſee your life hanging on a Tree*: Now to feign ſuch a Propheſie muſt be a horrid Sin, being literally *adding to Gods word* (*h*), to which a grievous Curſe is due.

(*h*) Revel. xxii. 18.

The Epiſtle from *Reparatus* and his African Council to this Pope, is more likely to be true, becauſe there is nothing of his Univerſal Supremacy in it: They call him *Holy Brother and Fellow-Prieſt*, nor do they expect Laws, but deſire advice from him: Yea, they require him to exclude from his Communion ſuch of the African Clergy, as came from them to *Rome* without leave (*i*); which ſhews the African Church ſtill oppoſed Appeals to the Pope.

(*i*) Ep. *Repar. Bin.* pag. 656. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1755.

The Firſt Council under this Pope was called at *Rome*, wherein He decreed according to *Juſtinian*'s deſire, *That it might Orthodoxly be ſaid, One of the Trinity was crucified for us in the Fleſh* (*k*). Now this Decree puts *Baronius* and *Binius* to ſtretch their Wits to ſave the Infallibility: For Pope *Hormiſda* had before judicially determined the quite contrary in a cauſe of Faith, *viz. That it could not be Orthodoxly ſaid ſo*: So that theſe Paraſites are to prove both parts of a contradiction true; and that two Popes who defined directly contrary to one another, were both in the right: Now here they ſhuffle and palliate this matter, calling Pope *John*'s diſannulling *Hormiſda*'s Decree, to be only a declaring his Opinion, how far this Sentence may, and how far it may not be held (*l*). But before, *Baronius* compares this Sentence with the *Heretical Addition to the Triſagion*, and tells us, *the Popes Legates* (*in* Hormiſda's *time*) *thought it was utterly to be rejected*: And that *the Eutychians were the Authors of it*; *yea, he magnifies* Hormiſda *for condemning it* (*m*). Yet Pope *John* ſays, it is an Orthodox Sentence, though ſtill divers Monks at *Rome* did not believe him nor receive

(*k*) Concil. Rom. ſub *Joh.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 657. Col. 1. *Lab.* 1761.

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 533. n. 26. pag. 185. & notis *Binij.*

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 519. n. 108. pag. 45. & n. 110. ibid. & n. 104. pag. 44.

ceive it: But took *Hormiſda* to have been in the right, and ſo far queſtioned *John*'s Infallibility, that as (*Liberatus* notes,) *They forſook his Communion* (*n*); and for my part I cannot ſee, but one of theſe Popes muſt neceſſarily be an Heretick.

(*n*) Ap. *Baron. An.* 533. n. 3. pag. 179.

An. Dom. 533. In this year they place a genuine Record of a conference at *Conſtantinople*, between the Catholick and Severian Hereticks (*o*). But *Binius* Notes own, this Conference was held before *Juſtinian* writ to Pope *John* for his Opinion; and therefore it ſhould have been placed before that Popes Roman Council, and is fraudulently ſet after, to make it ſeem as if the *Eaſt* had followed *Rome* in this Deciſion. To this Conference the Eaſtern Biſhops were ſummoned by the Emperor and their own chief Patriarch: And we may here obſerve, Firſt, That *Hypatius* Biſhop of *Epheſus* was Prolocutor, and is compared to St. *Peter* the Apoſtle (*p*). Secondly, When they ſpeak of the Opinions of the Fathers, cited by *Cyril* in the Council at *Epheſus* againſt *Neſtorius*, they reckon two Popes, *Fælix* and *Julius*, promiſcuouſly with the reſt, giving them no precedence, no mark of ſpecial priviledge (*q*). Thirdly, They reject divers Epiſtles, that bore the names of Orthodox Fathers, pretended to be kept among the Records at *Alexandria*, as forged and corrupted by their Heretical Biſhops; and ſay, *they muſt be excuſed from receiving their Enemies for Evidence* (*r*). Which juſt Rule, if the Romaniſts allow us in our Diſputes with them, the Controverſie would ſoon be ended. Fourthly, *Hypatius* truly affirms, that the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches were long time divided, about the manner of expreſſing themſelves as to the Trinity; the Orientals ſuſpecting the Occidentals to be Sabellians, and theſe imagining thoſe of the *Eaſt* were Arrians, till *Athanaſius* at laſt reconciled them by underſtanding of both Tongues (*s*); which ſhews that neither ſide pretended to Infallibility: And that Learning is the fitteſt qualification for a Judge of Controverſies. Laſtly, They ſay, *their Holy Mother the Catholick and Apoſtolick Church*

(*o*) Collat. *Conſt. Bin.* pag. 657. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1673.

(*p*) *Bin.* pag. 658. *Lab.* 1764.

(*q*) *Bin.* pag. 659. *Lab.* 1766.

(*r*) *Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* 1767.

(*s*) *Bin.* ibid. *Lab.* 1768.

Church of God, held it was Orthodox to ſay, that one of the Trinity did ſuffer for us in the Fleſh (t). Now this could not be meant of the Roman Church, where *Hormiſda*'s contrary Definition was ſtill in force, nor do they name the Pope in all their Conference: So that *Binius* is miſtaken in his Notion, that *Juſtinian* contrived this Conference to unite the Biſhops of the *Eaſt* with *Rome*; for he took no notice of the late Popes Sentence, but deſigned this Conference to ſettle the Truth; and for all the pretence of Union and Subjection in *Hormiſda*'s time, the Churches of the *Eaſt* and *Weſt* were not united till after this; when Pope *John* conſented to their Definition, and owned that not his Predeceſſor, but they were in the right.

(t) *Bin.* pag. 663. *Lab.* 1778.

§. 10. The time of Pope *Agapetus* entrance and death is not certainly known: *Anaſtaſius*, and from him *Du Pin*, allow him not one whole year: *Baronius* and *Binius* would have him ſit longer (u), but can only prove it by the dates of ſome Epiſtles which are not genuine. 'Tis certain he was dead before *May* 536. when *Mennas* Council at *Conſtantinople* met; wherefore he muſt enter in the year 535. The trueſt account of him is to be had in *Liberatus*, a Writer that knew him, Who ſaith, *He was well skilled in the Canons, and being ſent by the Gothick King*, Theodatus, *on an Embaſſy to* Juſtinian, *to divert his Army from* Italy, *he arrived at* Conſtantinople, *where he honourably received the Emperors Meſſenger, but would not admit* Anthimius *to his Preſence: After this he ſaw the Emperor, delivered his Embaſſy, which was rejected; However, (as Chriſts Embaſſador) neither the Princes nor the Empreſs could prevail with him to communicate with the lately ordained Biſhop of* Conſtantinople Anthimius, *unleſs he would prove himſelf Orthodox, and return to the Church which he had deſerted: Upon this* Anthimius *reſigned and went off, yet ſtill was under the Emperors Protection: Yet* Agapetus *by the favour of the Prince conſecrated* Mennas *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *and having deſigned* Pelagius *his Deacon*

An. Dom. 535.

(u) Vit. *Agapet.* *Bin.* pag. 665. Col. 1. *Lab.* 1785.

to

to remain there as his Reſident, he prepared to return to Italy, *but dyed at* Conſtantinople (*w*). Moſt of that which is added to this, is feigned by *Anaſtaſius* and the later Writers; except what another contemporary *Caſſiodorus* writes of *Agapetus, that he was ſo poor, that the Sacred Plate of St.* Peters *Church was forced to be Pawned for Mony to defray the Charges of this Embaſſy* (*x*). But *Anaſtaſius* his Fictions about the Popes quarreling with *Juſtinian* about his Faith, and the Emperors humbling himſelf, and adoring the Pope afterwards, have no truth at all in them. No, nor thoſe Miracles which *Binius* notes, and *Baronius* pretended this Pope did in his Journey (*y*); for they have no other Evidence for them than thoſe fabulous Legends, *Gregory*'s Dialogues and the *Pratum Spirituale* (*z*). And no Writer of Credit, or that lived in that Age, knew of any ſuch thing. The fore-named Authors for the credit of the Roman Martyrology, where *Agapetus* death is ſet down on the 12 of the Kal. of *October*, will have that be the right day of his dying: But I can hardly think he dyed ſo long before *Mennas* Council, which was in *May* 536. and there he is ſpoken of as lately deceaſed: I ſhall only note, that *Baronius* blunders his own Account wofully, by citing a Conſtitution of *Juſtinian*, directed to *Anthimius* as ſtill Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, dated on the Ides of *Auguſt* 536, (long after *Agapetus* death:) And upon this he Rails at *Theodora* and *Juſtinian* (*a*); and 'tis true, the Law is ſo dated and titled in the Novels (*b*): But there muſt be a fault either in the name of *Anthimius*, put inſtead of *Menna*'s, or in the Conſuls, becauſe the ſame Emperor directs another Conſtitution to *Menna*, in the ſame Month and the ſame Year, and ſome Copies read its date, 17 Kal. of *Auguſt* 536. which is the 16 of *July* (*c*): Wherefore the Annaliſt ſhould be cautious, how he makes Characters of Princes, on the uncertain Credit of theſe Dates.

(*w*) *Liberati* brev. cap. 21. 22. *Bin.* par. 2. pag. 191. *Lab.* 774.

(*x*) *Caſſiodor.* Ep. lib. 12. Ep. 20.

(*y*) Vit. Not. in *Agap. Bin.* pag. 665. Col. 2. *Lab.* 1787.

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 536. n. 68. pag. 254.

(*a*) *Baron. An.* 535. n. 64. pag. 227.

(*b*) Authent. Col. Novel. 16. pag. 34.

(*c*) Ibid. Novel. 42. pag. 77, & 78.

The

The Copy of *Juſtinian's* Letter to *John* the Second, before ſtuffed with Forgeries and undated, is here printed without the Additions, and dated in *January* ſaith *Binius*, in *June* ſaith *Labbè*, *An.* 533. (*d*). And it aſſures us, *John's* confirmation before related is ſpurious, becauſe here it is offered again to be confirmed by *Agapetus*, the day before the Ides of *March*, *An.* 535. And this Popes Confirmation is dated at *Conſtantinople*, four days after the Emperors Epiſtle: But *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, The Pope came not to *Conſtantinople* till the 10 of the Kal. of *May*; and *Juſtinian's* Letter ſuppoſes him then at *Rome*, and if ſo, how could the Pope receive and anſwer this Letter in four days time? But if *Agapetus* were at *Conſtantinople*, what need the Emperor write to him, or date his Letter from that City? So that I ſuſpect the Confirmation to be a Forgery, and *Labbè* himſelf notes, *Theſe things are not coherent* (*e*); For which we have a good reaſon in *Lactantius*, who ſaith, *Ea enim eſt mendaciorum natura ut cohærere non poſſunt* (*f*). Yet *Binius* is ſo immodeſt as to ſtretch this feigned Confirmation, to be a ſolemn confirming of all *Juſtinian's* Edicts and Conſtitutions in matters of Faith (*g*). Whereas that Emperor ſent the Conſtitutions to the Pope and other Patriarchs to be executed, not to be confirmed; he only adviſed with his Biſhops about them, but his own Authority was enough to ratifie them.

(*d*) Ep. *Juſtin.* ad *Agap. Bin.* pag. 666. col. 2. *Lab.* 1788.

(*e*) *Labbè* in Marg. 1789.

(*f*) *Lact.* Inſtit. lib. 5. § 3.

(*g*) *Bin.* not. in 1 Ep. *Agapet. Bin.* pag. 666. Col. 1. *Lab.* 1790.

To this is ſubjoyned that nauſeous Forgery called *Exemplar precum*, which hath been printed by the Editors four or five times over with variety of Titles, and here is ridiculouſly applied to *Juſtinian* (*b*).

(*h*) Exempl. prec. *Bin.* pag. 666. col. 2. *Lab.* 1790.

The matter of *Agapetus* Second and Third Epiſtle to the African Biſhops and *Reparatus* is not exceptionable; for the Pope calls them *his moſt loving Brothers*, *and owns it was not agreeable to the Canons to receive Clerks from* Africk *without their Letter*; wherefore he would forbear it, as they had enjoyned: He confeſſes alſo the Rights of a Metropolitan to be in the Biſhop of *Carthage* (*i*). But there are ſome ſuſpicions that

(*i*) Ep. 2 & 3. *Agap. Bin.* pag. 667. *Lab.* 1791, &c.

they are not genuine, for they ſay they were ſent by *Liberatus*: Now he had been at *Rome* a little before, and can ſcarce be ſuppoſed to be got back to *Afric*, and to return to *Rome* by the *5th* of the Ides of *September*: And which is worſe, (as *Labbè* truly obſerves,) *Liberatus* himſelf who writes the Story of *Agapetus*, ſpeaks but of one Journey to *Rome*, and ſays nothing of this ſecond: And beſides 'tis dated *Poſt. Conſ. Paulini*, which is wrong, unleſs they call *Belliſarius* his year by that name, which is *An.* 535. And then *Agapetus* was at *Conſtantinople*: So that we may fear the Forgers, who would have it thought all the World applied to *Rome*, have been at work here. However, if the third Letter be genuine, we learn from it that *Agapetus* came into the Papacy in Winter; for it ſeems *Reparatus* had writ to Pope *John*; but while his Meſſengers were ſtaied by the Winter from Sailing, he heard in *Afric* of *Agapetus* his Election. *Baronius* here affirms, that the Pope now ſent *Decretal* Letters to be publiſhed in *Africa*, which are not extant (*k*): But I believe there never were any ſuch Letters; for his advice might be accepted there perhaps, but his Decretals then had no Authority in that Church.

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 535. n. 42. pag. 222.

The Fourth Epiſtle to *Juſtinian* is very ſuſpicious, being dated with no Conſuls as the reſt uſe to be; it mentions alſo the Popes ſending Legates on the Ides of *October*, which if it were *An.* 534. he was not then Pope; if the next year, *Agapetus* muſt then be at *Conſtantinople*, (or dead there the 12 of the Kal. of that Month, if the Roman Martyrology be true:) Wherefore we need not be ſtartled at that incredible paſſage, *That* Juſtinian *had elevated the Roman See by ſuch Titles of Charity and Bounty, as exceeded their deſires and hopes* (*l*). For the Letter is not genuine; And I dare ſay, the Paraſites will not urge this, becauſe they think 'tis Juſtice, not Charity; and Right, not human Bounty, which gives *Rome* the higheſt Titles; and we are of Opinion, no Titles can exceed that Churches deſires, though they may its deſerts.

(*l*) Epiſt. 4. *Agap. Bin.* pag. 667. Col. 1. *Lab.* 1793.

Since

Since *Binius* ſuſpects the *5th* Epiſtle, as dated before *Agapetus* was Pope, and *Labbè* ſaith, *many things prove it falſe, and more than ſuſpected of impoſture, as being ſtolen out of* Hormiſda's, *and* Leo's *Letters, and naming* Theodatus *Conſul, who never bore that Office* (*m*); We may without more ado reject it, only noting the Forger reſolved right or wrong, to make the Pope the Mawl of all Hereticks.

(*m*) Ep. 5. *Agap. Bin.* pag. 668. col. 2. *Lab.* 1795.

The two Epiſtles to *Cæſarius* (ſuppoſing them genuine) are very frivolous, the *6th* being only to tell him that Eccleſiaſtical Goods muſt not be alienated: Which he knew better than the Pope; and *Symmachus* had writ this to him above 30 Year before: And the *7th* Epiſtle intimates that *Contumelioſus* a French Criminal Biſhop, whoſe Cauſe was decided by Pope *John*, had appealed again to *Agapetus*, which ſhews a Papal Decree was not deciſive: But either the Pope or this Letter hath had ill Luck, becauſe it contains in the decretal part, a flat contradiction, both forbidding, and allowing this Biſhop to ſay Maſs (*n*); wherefore, if we do not reject them, we may throw them by, as very inconſiderable.

(*n*) Ep. 6, & 7. *Agap. Bin.* pag. 669. *Lab.* 1798. & 1801.

Once more the Editors abuſe us with their old Forgery of *Exemplar Precum*, *their Corrupt rule of Faith*, which cannot without the higheſt impudence be put upon *Juſtinian* (*o*); and they confeſs here the Conſuls are miſtaken a whole year, yet they preſume to mend it, and obtrude it for genuine: And *Baronius* would have us believe *Juſtinian* did now repeat this profeſſion of his Faith upon the falſeſt and ſlighteſt conjectures (*p*) that can be imagined.

(*o*) *Bin.* pag. 670. col. 1. *Lab.* 1801. &c.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 536. n. 18. pag. 243.

§. II. The Council of *Conſtantinople* about the depoſition of *Anthimius*, and the Condemnation of *Severus* and his followers, was held, as *Binius* confeſſes, in the general Title, after *Agapetus* his death; and as oft as this Council mentions him, he is called *of happy Memory*: Yet in the Title on the Top, *Binius* ſaith, *It was held under* Agapetus *and* Mennas; which abſurdity of a Council being held under a dead Pope, moved *Labbè*

An. Dom. 536.

(q) *Bin.* pag. 671. *Lab.* Tom. v. pag. 3.

(r) *Du-Pin.* Eccleſ. Hiſt. Cent. 6. pag. 131.

bè to ſay it was *under* Mennas (q). The Hiſtory of this Council may be had from *Du-Pin* (r). But the Remarks on thoſe things in it, which either condemn the Errors, or ſavour of the Forgeries of *Rome*, are my buſineſs. Wherefore, I will firſt make ſome general obſervations on the whole: Secondly, conſider the depravations in the Acts. Thirdly, examine the falſhoods in the Notes.

(s) Concil. Conſt. *Bin.* p. 678. col. 1. *Lab.* col. 19.

(t) Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 687. *Lab.* 47.

(u) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 672. *Lab.* 3. & 4.

(w) Vid. Act. i. & alibi. *Bin.* pag. 689, 691, 696, & 710. Item *Lab.* pag. 54, 59, 71 & 118.

(x) *Bin.* Act. v. pag. 703. *Lab.* 61.

(y) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 761. *Lab.* 263.

(z) *Baron. An.* 536. n. 32. pag. 246.

Firſt, This Council was called to re-examine and confirm the Sentence of Pope *Agapetus*, and it conſiſted (all but five) of Eaſtern Biſhops (s), to whom *Juſtinian* ſent this Sentence for their Approbation. And *Agapetus* himſelf in a Letter writ a little before his death, deſires the Eaſtern Biſhops to ſignifie to him, *That they did approve of the judgment of the Apoſtolical Seat* (t); Which ſhews that neither the Emperor, the Pope, nor this Council did then take the Biſhop of *Rome* to be the ſole nor higheſt Judge. Secondly, *Mennas* the Patriarch was the Preſident of this Council, and ſat above and before thoſe five Biſhops, which the Annaliſt, and Annotator ſay were the Legates of *Agapetus*, and the Repreſentatives of the Roman Church (u). Thirdly, it is certain the Emperor *Juſtinian* convened this Council by his own ſole Authority; for every Action owns *They met by his Pious Command, and that his care had gathered this Holy Synod together* (w). And it is as certain that he only could and did confirm it; for *Mennas* the Preſident having heard the Synods Opinion, deſires the Emperor may be acquainted with it, *Becauſe nothing ought to be done in the Church without his Royal Conſent, and Command* (x). *And he finally did confirm their Decree by a ſpecial Edict, which made it valid* (y). So that this Council utterly confutes the Popes pretended right to convene all Councils, for which in this Age nothing but Forged evidence is produced. Fourthly, Though *Baronius* (z), and alſo *Binius* do affirm that *Agapetus* did both depoſe *Anthimius*, and chuſe *Mennas*, neither of them is true if they mean the Pope did it by his own Authority; for before the Council, *Juſtinian* (as this Synod

Synod often declares) did aſſiſt *Agapetus*, and made the Holy Canons Authentic in depoſing *Anthimius* (*a*). And becauſe he thought it was ſcarce yet Canonically done, he gets the Sentence againſt him confirmed by this Council: As for *Mennas*, he was only conſecrated by the Pope, who in his own Letter ſaith *Mennas was elected by the favour of the Emperor, and the conſent of the chief Men, the Monks and all Orthodox Chriſtians* (*b*); yea, the Council declares the Emperor choſe him by the general ſuffrage (*c*). So that theſe are falſe pretences deſigned to ſet up a ſingle Authority in the Pope, unknown to that Age.

(*a*) Act. i. *Bin.* pag. 677. *Lab.* 19. & alibi.

(*b*) *Bin.* Act. i. pag. 687. *Lab.* 47.

(*c*) Ibid. *Bin.* pag. 677. *Lab.* 19.

Secondly, In the Acts of this Council there are divers inſtances of the hand of a Roman depraver: The Title of the Monks Petition, as *Binius* Margen ſaith, *is not in the Greek* (*d*); yet he hath it both in Greek and Latain (*d*); and ſo hath *Labbè:* But it muſt be the addition of a Later Hand, the Greek being the Original; it is full of great ſwelling Words applied to *Agapetus* alone; But the Text ſpeaks to more than one, *Do not ye ſuffer, O ye moſt bleſſed* (e)——*Which ye* (O moſt bleſſed) *defending, receive ye our Petition* (*f*), and generally it runs in the plural number; So that it was addreſſed to the Pope with other Biſhops. The like corruption we meet with alſo in the Letter of the Eaſtern Biſhops, where the Title now is only to *Agapetus*; but the Text ſpeaks to more than one; yea, where the Greek is Μακαριώτατοι and Ἁγιώτατοι, The Latin Verſion of *Rome* changes it into *Beatiſſime*, and *Sanctiſſime*, adding *Pater* (*g*). Which ſhews the Forgers Fingers have been here. The aforeſaid Petition of the Monks, mentions an Image of *Juſtinian* abuſed by the Hereticks: The Greek calls it [τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου Θεοῦ εἰκόνα] *The Image of that Servant of God* (*b*), The Roman Verſion is *imaginem Dei veri*: The Image of the true God: As if theſe Heriticks had been *Iconoclaſts* before that controverſie was heard of. In the Biſhops Letter the Greek reads ——μαγγανείας καὶ μηχανικῆς πλάνης, which ſignifies by open force and ſecret fraud: For Μαγγανὶς is a Warlike Engine to batter with.

(*d*) Libel Monach. *Bin.* pag. 678. *Lab.* 22.

(e) Μακαριώτατοι, *Bin.* pag. 679. *Lab.* 23.

(*f*) *Bin.* pag. 681. *Lab.* 30.

(*g*) *Bin.* pag. 683, & 684. *Lab.* 38. &c.

(*b*) *Bin.* 679. *Lab.* 23.

with (*i*). The Tranſlator dreams of *Manichæan* Errors, which are nothing to the purpoſe here. In the Epiſtle of the Syrian Biſhops to *Juſtinian*, the Greek ſaith, *The Pope deſerved to follow the Emperors pious Footſteps*, and ſo *Labbè* reads it in the Latin: But in *Binius* (for fear this ſhould look mean) we have it *Veſtra pia veſtigia digna facienti* (*k*). The Title of *Hormiſda*'s Epiſtle to *Epiphanius* is corrupted in Latin by the addition of theſe words which are not in the Greek, *wherein he delegates to him the power of a Vicar of the Apoſtolical Seat, in receiving Penitents* (*l*): Which is confuted by the Epiſtle it ſelf, which ſpeaks of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, not as ſubjected, but united to the Roman; and doth not command, but deſire *Epiphanius* to joyn his care and diligence to the Popes, as they now had one friendſhip, both in Faith and Communion; yea, *Hormiſda* promiſes to act by the ſame meaſures which he recommends to *Epiphanius* (*m*). *Baronius* hath another corruption of his own, in a Letter from the Monks of *Hieruſalem* and *Syria*; for where they deſire *Juſtinian to cut off all that do not communicate with the univerſal Church of God, and the Apoſtolical Seat* (*n*); He leaves out *the univerſal Church, and puts in nothing but the Apoſtolical Seat* (*o*). In the ſame page he cuts off *Mennas* Title before the Sentence be pronounced, *viz. Mennas, the moſt Holy and Bleſſed univerſal Arch-Biſhop and Patriarch ſaid* (*p*): And he adds to the end of this Sentence, that it was *according to what* Hormiſda *and* Agapetus *had preſcribed* (*q*); whereas this being the Senſe of the Synod, gave Authority to what the later of theſe Popes had done; and the former, *Hormiſda*, was dead before this matter came into *Queſtion*. And now I am upon the Account of this Council in *Baronius*, I will alſo note, that in citing an Author which ſaith *Mennas obtained an* Univerſal Biſhopric——he adds, *that is, of the Churches ſubject to him* (*r*). Yet a little after he will not allow that Paraphraſe when the ſame words are applyed to the Popes (*s*), which ſhews his unfaithfulneſs in adding, and his partiality in expounding, two very

(*i*) *Bin.* 684. *Lab.* 41.

(*k*) *Bin.* pag. 707. *Lab.* 106.

(*l*) Act. v *Bin.* pag. 721. *Lab.* 151.

(*m*) Vid. ibid.

(*n*) *Bin.* pag. 708. *Lab.* 107.

(*o*) *Baron. An.* 536. n. 89. pag. 259.

(*p*) Id. ibid. n. 92.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 536. n. 95. pag. 260.

(*r*) Id. *An.* 536. n. 65. pag. 254.

(*s*) Ib. n. 106. pag. 263.

ill

ill properties in an Hiſtorian——But to proceed with *Binius* and *Labbè*: In the 5*th* Act there is a Syod at *Conſtantinople* held under *John* the Biſhop there *Anno* 518, wherein he is called *Moſt Holy and moſt Bleſſed Arch-Biſhop, Oecumenical Patriarch, and Father of Fathers* (*t*). Yet the Editors put firſt in the Margen, and then into the Latin Text, *under Hormiſda*; which words are not in the Greek, and are abſurd, becauſe the two Churches were not yet reconciled (*u*): Which is plain, becauſe in the Acclamations they cry, *let the Names of* Euphemius *and* Macedonius *be reſtored to the Church*: Which were two of their Orthodox Patriarchs and followers of *Acacius*, whoſe Names had been ſtruck out of the Dypticks by Heretical Princes, and ſtood then condemned by *Hormiſda*: And they cry again, *Are our Synodical powers gon away to Rome?* That is, muſt we reject our Orthodox Patriarchs becauſe *Rome* cenſures them? But the Latin corrupt verſion reads, *Synodica Romana modo valeant* (*w*); which would alter the Senſe, and perſuade ſuch as cannot look into the Greek, that *Rome*'s Decrees were valid at *Conſtantinople*; whereas, they Decree contrary to the Pope. In the Epiſtle from *John* of *Jeruſalem*, to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, the late Forgers have put in a Sentence to give ſome colour to the Worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin, which ſpoils the Senſe. The true reading is——; *Do ye moſt holy pray for the ſame things that we do, for it is the common duty of Biſhops* [ ] *to intercede for the peace of the Churches, and the Emperors Victory, and long Life* (*x*). But into this they thruſt in a line or two——thus——*it is the common Duty of Biſhops*; (*And pray ye to the Holy, Glorious Virgin* Mary, *the Mother of God with us*) *to intercede for the peace of the Churches*——which is a new Piece put into an old Garment ſo fooliſhly, that the Rent is very viſible. Finally, the ſubſcriptions to the fifth and laſt Act are corrupted: For whereas the Roman Deacons, *Theophanes* and *Pelagius* in all other Acts are placed after the Eaſtern Biſhops, here they are ſet before them in the Latin

(*t*) Act. 5. *Bin.* pag. 723, 725. *Lab.* 158, 162.

(*u*) *Bin.* pag. 743. *Lab.* 211.

(*w*) *Bin.* pag. 732. *Lab.* 182.

(*x*) Ep. *Johan. Hieroſ.* Act. 5. *Bin.* pag 734. *Lab.* 190.

tin Verſion (*y*). And whereas the Editors tell us, that *Juſtinian*'s Edict to confirm the Decrees of this Council is depraved in the Title to *Mennas* (*z*); I confeſs it is ſo; but the Roman Paraſites have depraved it by cutting off all thoſe Titles which the Novel here cited by them gives him (*a*), *viz.* To *Mennas* the *moſt Holy, and moſt Bleſſed, and Oecumenical Patriarch* — All which the Editors of the Council leave out.

(*y*) Act. v. *Bin.* pag. 759. *Lab.* 215.
(*z*) Conſt. *Juſtin. Bin.* pag. 761. *Lab.* 263.
(*a*) Authent. col novel. Conſt. 42. cod. pag. 77.

To theſe Notes of the depraving theſe Acts we may add a few remarks on ſome paſſages that are genuine, but oppoſe the late Notions of the Roman Church. The Epiſtle of *Agapetus* was not writ to *Peter* alone (as the Epiſtle pretends) but to him, and other Biſhops; whom the Pope calls in the firſt Line, *His beloved Brethren*; and to *Mennas* there he gives the Titles of *Brother, and fellow Biſhop* (*b*). The Syrian Biſhops Epiſtle to *Juſtinian*, declares that *Chriſt is the Head of the Church* (*c*), which Title the Pope had not yet claimed. In the Epiſtle from *John* of *Jeruſalem*, to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* (where *Leo* is called *Archbiſhop and Patriarch of* Rome) we have this memorable Truth, *That Chriſt who gave the power of binding and looſing to* Peter *the chief of the Apoſtles, gave it in general to the Epiſcopal Order* (*d*): Which confutes that Doctrine of all Biſhops receiving this power from the Pope. The Biſhop of *Tyre*'s Epiſtle to the Synod at *Conſtantinople*, calls the See of *Antioch*, which *Severus* the Heretick had invaded, *The Throne of the Apoſtolical Church of Antioch* (*e*), and makes one of his great crimes to be his admitting ſtrange Clerks Canonically deprived by their own Biſhop, to officiate without the conſent of ſuch as had ſentenced them: A crime ſo often committed by the Popes, that theſe uncanonical precedents are produced to prove he hath a priviledge ſo to do. The Sentence of *Mennas* againſt this *Severus*, and his Complices, recites *That they had contemned the Apoſtolical ſucceſſion in the Church of* Rome, *which had condemned them, and ſet at nought both the Patriarchal Throne of* Conſtantinople, *and the Synod under it*; *Yea, and the Apoſtolical Succeſſion, which the*

(*b*) Ep. *Agap.* Act. i. *Bin.* pag. 687. *Lab.* 47.
(*c*) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 706. *Lab.* 100.
(*d*) Ep. *Joan.* Hieroſ. Act. v. *Bin.* pag. 734. *Lab.* 190.
(*e*) Ep. *Epiphan.* Tyr. Act. v. *Bin.* pag. 736. *Lab.* 195.

the Lord and Saviour of all had ſetled in thoſe holy places: And above all, had deſpiſed the Sentence of the Oriental Dioceſs decreed againſt them (l). So that their greateſt fault was not the contemning the Popes Authority, and Apoſtolical Succeſſion was ſetled in other Churches by Chriſt, as well as in that of *Rome*. Laſtly, The Conſtitution of *Juſtinian* is made on purpoſe to give validity to the Sentence of the Pope and the Synod againſt *Anthimius* and the Hereticks, declaring it was the cuſtom for all preceding Orthodox Emperors, to confirm the Decrees of Councils; and it ſays in the concluſion, this Law was publiſhed, *that none might be ignorant of thoſe things which the Biſhops had agreed on, and the Emperor had confirmed* (g). So that it is a fallacious Note of the Editors Margen to ſay; *That it was the duty of Emperors to take care that the Decrees of the Fathers and the Pope were executed.* Which makes their Maſter to be no more than their Servant and under Officer.

(f) Sent. *Men. Bin.* pag. 758. *Lab.* 255.

(g) Conſtit. *Juſt.* poſt. Act. v. *Bin.* pag. 761. *Lab.* 263.

In the Notes on this Council are many Falſhoods, which may be diſcovered by what is already obſerved. Only we may conſider ſome few of them more particularly: As firſt, He takes it upon *Baronius* his credit (*b*), that *Agapetus* left the Weſtern Biſhops his Legates, and that their Power continued after his deceaſe; and thence boldly, but falſly affirms, *That theſe Legates procured the Synod to meet, and that they condemned theſe Hereticks by the Authority of their deceaſed Maſter*, whoſe Legate alſo he feigns *Mennas* was (*i*); and in expreſs contradiction to the Council, he will have theſe Italian Biſhops to be Preſidents with *Mennas* (k); yet immediately calls him alone the Preſident of this Synod (*l*). Now all this is to impoſe upon the Reader, as if nothing could be done without Papal Authority: But we have proved that *Juſtinian* called and confirmed this Council, and *Mennas* preſided ſolely in it: The *Acts* alſo take no notice of theſe Weſtern Biſhops having any Legantine power from *Agapetus*; and I ſhall ſhew preſently, that before this Council roſe there was a new Pope choſen, who ſhould

(h) *Baron. An.* 536. n 73. pag. 255.

(i) Not. *Bin.* pag. 763. *Lab.* 269.

(k) Ib. *Bin.* pag. 764. *Lab.* 270.

(l) Ibid. 764. col. 2. *Lab.* 272

have renewed their Commiſſion to make it valid, but did not: So that they muſt ſuppoſe the dead and the living Pope to have ſupream Authority both at once: Who can ſwallow theſe groſs Fictions? Again, *Mennas* and the Council declare, *That Pope followed the Canons in allowing* Anthimius *time to come in and Repent, and therefore they followed him* (m); but *Binius* Notes turn this and ſay, *That* Agapetus *commanded the Synod to uſe this mercy* (n): But it is very pleaſant to hear *Clodius* accuſe, and *Binius* complain of the Modern Greeks, for forging the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch, applied to* John *in his own Council of* Conſtantinople (o). But the Latins are even with them and far out-do them, (if it were ſo) for they (as we have ſeen) have put in that Title for *Agapetus* into the Latin when it was not in the Greek, and have left it out before *Mennas* name, though in the Code it be given him: So that they cannot fairly complain; Yet after all, I can prove by authentic Records of this Age, That this Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*, was given to the Patriarch of both old and new *Rome*; nor is this Council of *John* corrupted by the modern Greeks, and *Gregory* is certainly miſtaken in ſaying it was not uſed before his time: But the weakeſt complaint of Forgery, and the worſt proof of it imaginable, is that of *Baronius* and *Binius*, who pretend the Greeks have fraudulently put the names of *Euphemius* and *Macedonius* Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, before Pope *Leo*'s (p); and the Annaliſt and Annotator ſhew ſhameful ignorance, in thinking to prove by the Liturgy of St. *Mark*, that the Pope of *Rome* was prayed for firſt in all Churches: For though in that Office, God is deſired to preſerve *Their moſt Holy and moſt Bleſſed Pope, whom he did fore-ordain, that his Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church ſhould chooſe by their common Suffrages, and alſo for their moſt holy Biſhop* (q). Yet this (being the Office uſed in the whole Alexandrian Patriarchate,) muſt be meant of the Alexandrian Patriarch, (who was called Pope ever ſince *Athanaſius* his time,) and was the Biſhop of that Church

(m) Act. 1. *Bin.* pag. 687. *Lab.* 47.

(n) Not. *Bin.* pag. 764. Col. 2. *Lab.* 272.

(o) Ib. *Bin.* p. 765 *Lab.* 274.

(p) *Bin.* p. 766. *Lab.* 274. *Baron.* Tom. 7. *An.* 518. n. 20. pag. 7.

(q) Lit. D. *Marc.* in Bib. Patr. edit. *Pariſ.* Tom. 2 pag. 35.

Church where these Prayers were made: To prove which and shame this illiterate Exposition, I shall produce *Jac. Goar*, a rigid Papist, the Editor of the Greek Euchologion; who thus speaks, *The Greeks never name the supream Bishop of all* (he means him of *Rome*) *in publick; wherefore* Urban *the Fourth desired of the Emperor* Mich. Palæologus (*An. Dom.* 1263. that is, 700 year after this,) *that in their sacred Offices, the Popes name should be recited out of the Dypticks, with the other four Patriarchs, as the first and chiefest sign of their union with* Rome: For which he Cites *Nicetas*, lib. 5. (*r*). Here therefore is a proof, which proves only the mistake of them that produce it: And for the Objection, it is a known Custom for all Churches, to name their own Patriarchs before those of other Churches; so that it is no wonder, that at *Constantinople Euphemius*'s name should be placed before *Leo*'s.

(*r*) Euchолog. in not. *Jac. Goar.* pag. 144.

As soon as the Council under *Mennas* was ended, the Decrees were sent to *Peter* Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, who by the Command of the Emperor, called a Council there to confirm them (*s*).

(*s*) Concil. Hieros. *Bin.* pag. 766. *Lab.* 275.

In this year *Labbè* places the Synod of *Auvergne*, which met, as the Preface owns, by the precept of King *Theodebert* (t); there is no Pope mentioned in it: *Binius* places it in the year 541. under *Vigilius*, but *Sirmondus* proves he was mistaken.

(*t*) Concil. Auver. *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 2. pag. 31. *Lab.* col. 1803. *An. Dom.* 533.

§. 12. As soon as the news of *Agapetus* his death came to *Rome*, *Liberatus* saith, *Sylverius* was made Pope by *Theodatus* the Gothick King (*u*). *Anastasius* saith, it was after one Month and 28 days vacancy (*w*); Which is very probable, being a sufficient time for the intelligence to come from *Constantinople*; and if we allow that *Agapetus* died about a Month before *Mennas* Council, this entrance of *Sylverius* will prove to be while that Council sat. *Baronius* saw this, and fearing it would ruin his invention of the Western Bishops, there being *Agapetus* his legates, he blunders the time of *Sylverius*'s Election; and though he reject *Anastasius*

(*u*) *Liberat.* Brev. *Bin.* pag. 191. cap. 22.
(*w*) Vit. *Sylver. Bin.* pag. 770. Col. 1. *Lab.* 287.

ſtaſius account, on whom (in many leſs probable Reports) he often relies; Yet he will not fix any other time, and ſo leaves it uncertain; only in general he and *Binius* ſay, he was elected in the end of this year; which cannot be; becauſe *Agapetus* certainly died in the Spring, and it required no long time for the News to come from *Conſtantinople.* As to this *Sylverius*, it is certain from *Liberatus*, he was the Son of Pope *Hormiſda*; and *Baronius* with *Binius* only conjecture that he was lawfully begotten; they would prove it indeed by this Argument, *That otherwiſe he would have been irregular, and the Roman Clergy would not have choſen him:* But they forget that his Election was not regular; For *Theodatus* was in haſte, and would not ſtay for that, but forced the Roman Clergy to ſubſcribe, having got money of *Sylverius*, as their own Pontifical relates. *Baronius* calls this fear and vile ſubmiſſion of the Roman Clergy, *their Clemency and a worthy Example* (x); yet confeſſes this Pope *deſerved to be kept out:* However, being got into the ſanctifying Chair, he magnifies him, but very unjuſtly; for *Procopius* a creditable Author, who was ſoon after at *Rome* with *Belliſarius*, tells us, Sylverius *firſt ſwore to keep the City of* Rome *for* Vitiges *the Gothick King* (y). And ſo ſoon as *Belliſarius* came before it, he was the principal inſtrument to perſuade the Romans, who had ſworn with him, to deliver up that City (z): *Baronius* would conceal this Perjury, and therefore though he cite *Procopius* here, yet he ſaith no more than that *Vitiges* admoniſhed the Pope and Senate, to keep faithful to the Goths (*a*), who indeed had been extreamly civil to the Roman Church; and though they were Arrians, yet (as their Enemy *Procopius* tells us,) *they had ſuch a reverence for the holy places, that they did not hurt the Churches of St.* Peter *or St* Paul; *yea, they gave liberty to the Catholick Prieſts to ſerve God in their own way* (b). Which confutes the falſe Reports of their Cruelty, in deſtroying the Churches and Bodies of the Martyrs at *Rome*, mentioned in the Pontifical, and in *Paulus Diaco-*

(x) *Baron. An.* 536. n. 123. pag. 267.

(y) *Procop.* de bel. Goth. lib. 1. pag. 173.

(z) Id. ibid. pag. 181.

(a) *Baron. An.* 537. n. 5. pag. 269.

(b) *Procop.* de bel. Goth. l. 2. pag. 232.

Diaconus (c). However *Sylverius* turned once more, as *Procopius* ſaith, and was ſuſpected by *Belliſarius* to have deſigned to betray the City of *Rome* once more to the Goths, for which he depoſed and baniſhed him (*d*); and *Marcellinus* an Author of great credit, and of that time, ſaith, Sylverius *favoured* Vitiges, and for that cauſe *Belliſarius* depoſed him from his Biſhoprick (*e*). I know *Liberatus* (a mortal Enemy to *Vigilius*) would have this to be a Calumny, invented by *Theodora*, and carried on by *Vigilius* the ſucceeding Pope, who had promiſed *Belliſarius* two Hundred Crowns to get *Sylverius* ejected, and himſelf admitted (*f*); and *Anaſtaſius* with *Paulus Diaconus* follow his Account: But the two former Authors are in this caſe more worthy of Credit; however this is certain, *Belliſarius* did depoſe and baniſh *Sylverius*, and got *Vigilius* Elected, who fearing his Rival ſhould be reſtored, got him at laſt into his Hands, and barbarouſly cauſed him to be ſtarved to death. This is a ſad Story of two Popes, *Sylverius* uncanonically elected, a Simoniack and a perjured Perſon; and *Vigilius* a favourer of Hereticks, one that is ſaid to have hired falſe Witneſs, and to have given Mony to make the See void, and at laſt a Murtherer.

(c) *Paul. Diac.* lib 17. p. 170.

(d) *Procop.* lib. 1. pag. 269.

(e) *Marcelin. Com. Chronic.* indic. 15. p. 15.

(f) *Liberat. Brev. cap. 22. Bin.* pag. 191, &c.

Which ſhews, how little reaſon there is for *Baronius* and the Notes, to make ſuch a ſtir which was the true Pope of theſe two. They will have *Sylverius* to remain the rightful Pope while he lived, and ſo Rail freely at *Vigilius* as an Heretick, and Bloody Uſurper (*g*). But they cannot prove this by any Evidence, but only by a manifeſtly forged Epiſtle of *Sylverius*. And the contrary is very certain, becauſe the Emperor, the Gallican Churches and all did own *Vigilius* for the true Pope long before *Sylverius* his death, and he openly acted as ſuch all that time. Wherefore we muſt reject that Dream of *Baronius*, who ſaith (without any ground,) that *Vigilius* did Abdicate the Papacy for ſix days upon the death of his Competitor, and got himſelf new choſen; and this purged

(g) Notis in vit. *Sylver. Bin.* pag. 771. *Lab.* 289. *Baron. An.* 537. n. 18. pag. 277, 278.

purged him of all Crimes, and in a moment made him a Saint and a rare Pope: He would force this Fiction out of *Anaſtaſius*, (who in like Caſes he generally deſpiſes,) who only ſaith, *the See was void ſix days*, but plainly means *after* Sylverius *was depoſed*; for he reckons *Vigilius* his time from thence, allotting him above 17 years and 6 Months; that is, near two years more than *Baronius* allows.

There are but two Epiſtles aſcribed to *Sylverius*, and they are the only Evidence to prove him the true Pope after he was Depoſed; yet it is certain both are Forged. The firſt charges *Vigilius* with Simony, yea, excommunicates and deprives him for uſurping the Papacy; it is dated with the name of *Baſilius*, whereas *Baronius* and the Annotator ſay, there was no ſuch Conſul in his time (*h*). And *Labbè* ſaith, it is to be rejected for the Barbarity of the Style, and other reaſons, and concludes the miſtake of the Conſul, ſhews the bold ignorance of *Mercator*, the Author of this Impoſture. Now obſerve for the ingenuity and credit of *Baronius*, that this Epiſtle not only ſerves him to clear *Sylverius* from Simony, and to prove him the true Pope, but he calls this odious Forgery, *The Sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, and the Exerciſe of that Power, which he had to Abſolve or Damn Eternally all People* (i), which is no leſs than Blaſphemy.

(*h*) Ep. 1. *Sylver.* *Bin.* pag. 772. col. 1. *Lab.* 291.

(i) *Baron. An.* 539. n. 4. pag. 295.

The Second Epiſtle to *Amator* is ſo groſs a Fiction, that both *Baronius* and *Binius* reject it, being contrary to the true Hiſtory delivered by *Liberatus*, whom the Notes call *the moſt faithful Writer of this time* (k): *Labbè* agrees with them that it is ſpurious, and ſhews that *Mercator* ſtole it out of *Gregory*'s Epiſtles, wiſhing *that the like cenſure which is paſſed on this, were paſſed upon many more of theſe Writings.* But the Letter of *Amator* to *Sylverius*, (which *Labbè* ſaith, Learned men ſuſpect to be as falſe as the Popes anſwer to it,) *Baronius* will have to be genuine; and from this ſlight Forgery alone, he proves, *That all the Catholick World groaned together, at the ignominies put upon the Biſhop of the Univerſal Church*

(*k*) Ep. 2. *Sylv.* *Bin.* ib. *Lab.* 293

Church (l): A rare Hiſtorian! Whoſe Aſſertions and his Evidence are both falſe.

(l) *Baron. An.* 539. n. 5. pag. 296. *An. Dom.* 536.

Binius places the Second Council of *Orleance* in this year, but *Labbe* from *Sirmondus* puts it three years ſooner, *An.* 533. in the time of Pope *John* the Second (*m*); it was called, as the Preface ſaith, by the Command of the King of *France*, and made very good Canons, without Papal Advice or Authority. *Binius* his Notes here blunder this and the following Council, and will keep King *Clovis* alive three year longer than Nature allowed him, to ſupport a Fable of this Kings giving the Pope a Golden Crown, *An.* 514. (*n*) whereas he died *An.* 511. (*o*).

(*m*) Concil. Aurel. 2. *Bin.* pag. 773. col. 1. *Lab.* 1779.

(*n*) Notis *Bin.* pag. 774. col. 2.

(*o*) Vid. *Sirm.* notas in Concil. 3. Aur. *Lab.* 305. *An. Dom.* 358.

The Third Council of *Orleans*, *Binius* ſets *An.* 540. But *Labbè* more truly places it here (*p*). However, it takes no notice of any Pope, though *Vigilius* about this time is pretended to have writ to *Cæſarius* Biſhop of *Arles*. This Synod made divers Canons for Diſcipline; and by the ſecond Canon it appears, they were zealous for the Celibate of the Clergy: But the fourth ſhews, that hitherto the Canons in this caſe had not been obeyed; and the ninth Canon Decrees, *That if any Clerks having Wives or Concubines were ignorantly ordained, they ſhould not be removed.*

(*p*) Concil. Aurel. 3. *Bin.* Tom. 2. pag. 2. *Lab.* 295.

§. 13. *Vigilius* was made Pope immediately after *Sylverius* was depoſed, and while the Goths beſieged *Belliſarius* in *Rome*, which was in this year: But the Editors from *Baronius* write *An.* 540. upon this entrance *, to cover the Fable of his new Election, after the death of *Sylverius*: But he muſt come in in the year 537; For *Marcellinus* places *Vigilius* his death *An.* 554. (*q*), which makes up the 17 years and odd time that *Anaſtaſius* truly allots *Vigilius*; whoſe Succeſſor *Pelagius* entred, as *Baronius* and the Editors own, *An.* 555, which is but 15 whole year from that year 540, in which (they ſay) he entred; and from which they falſly compute his time, who writ Letters dated *An.* 538, and acted in all things as the ſole true Pope, from the time *Sylverius*

An. Dom. 537.

* Vita *Vigil. Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 2 pag. 1. *Lab.* Tom. 5. pag. 306.

(q) *Marcellin.* Chron. P. C. *Baſil. An.* 13. pag 57.

rius was depoſed; which was according to *Anaſtaſius*, after he had ſat one year and five Months (r); and he followed Writers of undoubted credit, that is, *Marcellinus*, who places his depoſition and *Vigilius* his entrance *An.* 537 (s); ſo doth *Genebrard* (t), who with *Platina* allow *Sylverius* only ſome odd time above one year, in which all Writers before *Baronius* agree. His invention therefore it was to aſcribe above 4 years to *Sylverius* (u), that this falſe Chronology might cover his deviſable, of a new Election of *Vigilius*, *An.* 540. which we juſtly reject as an idle Fable, invented to ſave the Honour of the Roman Chair: Yet it is well *Baronius* did not think *Vigilius* the true Pope all this time, for by that means we have his true Character, who, he ſaith, was *driven on with the Whirlwind of Ambition, and like Lucifer fell from Heaven,——that his Sacriledge cried out on every ſide——he calls him a Schiſmatick, a Simoniack, an Uſurper, a wretched Man, an Heretick, a Wolf, a Thief, a falſe Biſhop, and an Antichriſt* (w); aggravating his Crimes with all his Rhetorick, wherein he rather exceeds the Bounds of Modeſty than of Truth; for he really was extreamly wicked, and beyond the power of the ſanctifying Chair it ſelf, to make him Holy. We have ſo fully deſcribed the Acts of this Pope, and all the falſe Stories about him in the following Hiſtory of the Fifth General Council, that we may here paſs him by, with a few brief Remarks.

(r) Vita *Sylver.* ut ſupra.

(s) *Marcel.* Chron. pag. 56.

(t) *Genebrard.* l. 3. pag. 464.

(u) *Baron. An.* 540. n. 3. pag. 301.

(w) *Baron. An.* 538. n. 18, 19, 20. p. 277, 278.

Firſt, *Liberatus* aſſures us, *Vigilius* did make good his promiſe to *Theodora* the Empreſs, and communicated with Hereticks (x). *Anaſtaſius*, a later Author of no credit denies this, and *Binius* is ſo fond of this Pope-excuſing Fiction, that he puts into the Text theſe words, *See how* Vigilius (*though he came by evil means into the Papacy,*) *as ſoon as he got into that holy Chair eſtabliſhed by Gods Promiſe, was changed into another Man, condemning the Hereſie he had promiſed to approve* (y). Which falſe and fooliſh Parentheſis *Labbè* was aſhamed of, and leaves it out.

(x) *Liberat.* Brev. cap. 22. *Bin.* pag. 192.

(y) Vita *Vigil.* ap. *Bin.* & *Lab.* ut ſupra.

Secondly,

Secondly, There are very many idle Stories in *Anaſtaſius* his life of this Pope, ſome of which I will briefly recite, the bare relation of them being enough to diſprove them, *viz.* That when the People of *Rome* had accuſed *Vigilius* for a Murderer, and got the Empreſs to ſend for him Priſoner to *Conſtantinople*; the Romans as he was going off, firſt deſired his Prayers, and then threw Stones at him —— That though he was brought Priſoner to *Juſtinian*, yet the Emperor met and kiſſed him, and the People ſang that Hymn —— *Behold the Lord the King cometh, &c.* —— Which being applied to the Pope is Blaſphemy, and ſo the Editors and *Baronius* counted it, as did alſo Pope *Simplicius*, when the Heretical Biſhop of *Alexandria* entring into *Conſtantinople*, permitted his Party to ſing the words of an Hymn *only due to Chriſt* (*z*). The reſt ſhall be obſerved in the Hiſtory of the *5th* Council, where we may find alſo the Blunders, Fictions and Contradictions of the Notes expoſed, and ſo will mention but few of them here (*a*), *viz.* That *Vigilius* cunningly Abdicated the Papacy after the death of *Sylverius*, and got himſelf new-elected by the Roman Clergy, who were divinely inſpired in that act.——That *Vigilius* was a Catholick, and only polluted by communicating with Hereticks, (which was a horrid Crime formerly in *Acacius*.)——That *Belliſarius* was denied a Triumph at *Conſtantinople*, for his ill uſage of the Pope.——That *Vigilius* Anathematized the Empreſs *Theodora*, and that God thereupon deſtroyed her.—— That the Roman Church is ſo ſecured by Providence, that it is no blot to it, if we can prove this Pope Simoniacal and Heretical——(I ask by the way, why then do they tell ſo many Lies to cover this?)—— That the Eaſtern Biſhops depended upon *Vigilius* his Judgment, and ſtayed till he came to *Conſtantinople*, before they would ſubſcribe the Edict againſt the three Chapters.——That *Juſtinian* after his coming revoked this Edict.—That the Pope finally confirmed the *5th* Council,——And laſtly, That it was Sacriledge

(*z*) *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 1. pag. 436. *Lab.* 1071. & *Baron. An.* 476. pag. 318.

(*a*) Notis in Vit. *Vigil. Bin.* pag. 2. *Lab.* 308.

in the Emperour, to preſume to depoſe or confirm a Pope. —— All which we ſhall ſhew to be notorius Falſhoods.

The firſt Epiſtle of *Vigilius* is writ to three notorious Hereticks, wherein he aſſures them he holds the ſame Faith with them (*b*); and is ſo heretical, that the Editors are aſhamed of it, and print only the beginning of it, pretending from *Baronius* that ſome Eutychian writ it in his name (*c*). But the Reader will remember, that the Annaliſt always condemns genuine Writings, if they reflect on the Pope, and juſtifies Forgeries, if they magnifie him; of which this is another clear inſtance; for *Liberatus* who was a little before called *the moſt faithful Writer of his time*, hath this Epiſtle at large, and affirms *Vigilius* writ it (*d*). Yea, *Victor Tuennenſis* hath recorded it as this Popes almoſt in the ſame ſyllables in his Chronicle (*e*), who is another Credible Writer of that Age. And both theſe Africans did ever after look on *Vigilius* as an Heretick for this, and ſo he was, but ſecretly for fear of *Juſtinian*.

(*b*) *Vigil.* Ep. 1. *Bin.* pag. 3. *Lab.* 311.

(*c*) *Baron. An.* 538. n. 15. pag. 277.

(*d*) *Liberat.* Brev. cap. 22. *Bin.* pag. 192.

(*e*) *Victor. Tuen.* Chron. pag. 9.

To whom about this time *Vigilius* openly writ an Orthodox Letter, though *Baronius* and the Editors place it *Anno* 540. and call it his 4*th* Epiſtle, pretending it was writ after *Baronius* his invented new election, and when the Holy Chair had ſet him right in Faith (*f*). But my reaſon why I judge it writ *Anno* 538 ſoon after his entrance, is becauſe it was cuſtomary for a new Pope to write to the Emperor, and give an Account of his Faith; and ſince *Vigilius* had been advanced by *Juſtinian*, it is not at all likely he ſhould ſtay almoſt three years before he ſent an Embaſſy to enquire if he were Orthodox; and this Epiſtle having no Date they have clapt to it, another to *Mennas*, with a Date that ſmells of Forgery, becauſe the Emperors Embaſſador is made to ſubſcribe to the Popes Letter *Anno* 540, which is a thing ſo unuſual, that either *Juſtinian* highly ſuſpected *Vigilius*, or this Poſtſcript is added by *Mercator* (*g*). However it being certain that *Vigilius* had writ privately to *Anthimius*

(*f*) Ep. 4. *Vigil.* ad *Juſtin. Bin.* pag. 5. *Lab.* 315.

(*g*) Ep. 5. *Vigil. Bin.* pag. 6. *Lab.* 318.

thimius, *Severus* and *Theodoſius*, that he was of the ſame Faith with them, and it being alſo probable that he writ theſe open Letters to *Juſtinian* and *Mennas* at the ſame time wherein he anathematizes thoſe three Hereticks by name, and profeſſes himſelf Orthodox, this proves him a moſt egregious Hypocrite and Diſſembler in points of Faith. I ſhall only briefly note on this fourth Epiſtle, that *Vigilius* reckning up the names of his immediate Predeceſſors, names not *Sylverius* among them, which ſeems to intimate he was then alive: And Secondly, if *Mercator* did not thruſt in that Sentence, *That to diſturb, or diminiſh the Priviledges of the Apoſtolical Seat, appeared as bad as violating the Faith:* If this (ſay,) be not a latter Addition, we may infer, That *Vigilius* was more concerned for the power of his See, than for the Faith.

That which the Editors call the Second Epiſtle, was writ to one *Eutherius Anno* 538: And though they and *Baronius* ſay he was then no true Pope (*b*); yet the Collectors of the Decretal Epiſtles did not think ſo, for they have put this among the Decretals of true Popes. *Du Pin* hath well obſerved, that the latter part of this Epiſtle is forged by *Mercator*, where *Vigilius* is ſuppoſed ſo ignorant of Greek, (after he had lived long in *Greece*,) as to derive *Cephas*, (the name of St. *Peter*) from Κεφαλὴ, an Head. And in this corrupt part is that abſurd Sentence,—*That no true Believer was ignorant, that all Churches had their beginning from* Rome: Which though a Forgery, ſerves the Editors to note upon in the Margen, *The Church of* Rome *is the Mother and Miſtreſs of all Churches:* Of which they have no better evidence than ſuch Traſh, and ſo muſt be content with ſuch as they have.

(*b*) Ep. 2. *Vigil. Bin.* pag. 3. *Lab.* 311.

The Third Epiſtle to *Cæſarius* Biſhop of *Arles*, was writ in the ſame year; and proves that *Vigilius* was taken for the true Pope, as well by this eminent Father (*i*), as by *Eutherius*, *Anno* 538.

(*i*) Ep. 3. *Vigil. Bin.* pag. 4. Col. 2. *Lab.* 314.

An. Dom. 544. The Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Epiſtles are writ to *Auxanius* Succeſſor to *Cæſarius*, and ſhew *Vigilius* was then ſo much at the Emperors devotion, that he durſt not grant a Pall to a French Biſhop without the leave of *Juſtinian* (*k*); and when he had (above a year after) got this leave, he tells *Auxanius* he was obliged to pray for the Emperor and the Empreſs, who had given their conſent (*l*). Now if *Theodora* were ſo great a Friend to Hereticks as *Baronius* pretends, 'tis plain, *Vigilius* then was a Favourite of hers, which makes him ſtill ſuſpected to be inclined to Hereſie: But there is one miſtake in this Epiſtle, *viz.* That his Predeceſſor had granted a Pall to *Cæſarius*, which *De Marca* ſaith is falſe, and affirms this *Auxainus* to have been the firſt Legate the Pope made in *France:* A hopeful High-Prieſt to begin that Uſurpation upon Metropolitans.

(*k*) Ep. 6. *Vigil. Bin.* pag. 7. col. 1. *Lab.* 319.

(*l*) Ep. 7. *Vigil. Bin.* ib. *Lab.* 320.

An Dom. 546. In this year was that Edict put out, which condemned the three Chapters; and here the Editors call it, *The Edict of the moſt pious Emperor* Juſtinian, *containing a Confeſſion of Faith, and a Confutation of the Hereſies, that are contrary to the Catholick Church of God* (*m*). But for fear *Vigilius* and his Party might appear Heretical for oppoſing this Orthodox Edict, the Editors will not print it here, but thruſt it on ſome hundred Pages further (*n*). And put in here their falſe Comment before the Text, hoping by the ſham Stories in theſe Notes, to take off the Readers averſation to this Heretical Pope: But ſince all the Errors of theſe Notes are confuted at large in the Hiſtory of the Fifth Council, I will only name a few of them now, *viz.* That *Pelagius* the Popes Secretary always oppoſed this Edict, is falſe, for he afterwards ſubſcribed it.——He ſaith *Vigilius*, *Pontianus* (whoſe Letter is here printed) and *Facundus*, who writ againſt this Edict, were Orthodox. ——But the Fifth Council condemns all for Hereticks, who wrote for the three Chapters here cenſured; and none but Heretical Writers could take upon them to confute an Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith: The Decree

(*m*) Titul. Edict. ap. *Bin.* pag. 8 col. 2. *Lab.* 323.

(*n*) Edictum vide *Bin.* pag. 151. *Lab.* 638.

cree of *Vigilius* for ſilence, with his prudence and courage, are all Fictions, as ſhall be ſhewn in due place.

Vigilius had now been near three years at *Conſtantinople*, and carried fair with *Juſtinian*, ſo that doubtleſs he had ſigned his Edict, which condemned the perſons of *Theodorus*, *Theodoret* and *Ibas*, and their Heretical Writings; yet here is an Epiſtle of his to a Scythian Biſhop, citing his Conſtitution (which defends theſe three Chapters,) and wiſhes the perſons of *Theodorus*, *&c.* might not be condemned, as ſome favourers of Hereſie deſired: Yet in the ſame Epiſtle (*o*) he ſaith, he had Suſpended his two Deacons for defending the three Chapters, and would ſhortly Excommunicate them: Now what the Notes on this Epiſtle ſay, *That both the Oppoſers and Defenders of the three Chapters hated* Vigilius (*p*), is no wonder, for he was falſe to all Parties, and ſuch trimming Sycophants, who ſtrive to pleaſe all, get the favour of no body. *An. Dom.* 550. (*o*) Ep. 12. *Vigil. Bin.* pag. 10. Col. 2. *Lab.* 557. (*p*) Not. in Ep. 12. *Bin.* pag. 11. Col. 2.

The Fifteenth Epiſtle to the Univerſal Church, *Baronius* and the Editors do not cenſure; but it is a meer Forgery, being falſly dated (as they own) in the 26 of *Juſtinian* 552, they alter it to 551. *Binius* found but part of it in *Baronius*, ſo prints no more: But *Labbè* adds a great deal more, not ſaying where he had it (*q*): As to the matter of it, the Story of this Popes ſufferings at *Conſtantinople* is falſe and improbable, not atteſted by any credible Writer of that time: And whereas he ſaith, he had Excommunicated and Depoſed *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and Suſpended *Mennas* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, that muſt be falſe, becauſe the Popes Legates in the ſixth General Council affirm, that *Mennas died the 21ſt year of* Juſtinian, (*four year before the Date of this Letter,*) *An.* 547 (*r*). Wherefore this Epiſtle and the Inſtrument of Condemnation againſt *Theodorus* and *Mennas* are Forgeries (*s*): And it is very unjuſt, for *Baronius* and the Annotator on the credit of ſuch ſtuff ſo rudely to rail at *Juſtinian*, as if he were the vileſt Heretick and greateſt Monſter *An. Dom.* 551. (*q*) Epiſt. 15. *Vigil. Bin.* pag. 11. c. 2. *Lab.* 327. (*r*) Concil. 6. gen. *Bin.* Tom. 2 par. 1. pag 21. (*s*) Damnatio *Theo.* &c. *Bin.* pag. 12. Col. 1. *Lab.* 334.

ſter upon Earth. There are many other things in theſe Notes deſerving cenſure (*t*), *viz.* The affirming that *Theodorus* of *Cæſaria* depoſed *Zoilus* of *Alexandria*, and put in *Apollinaris*; whereas *Liberatus* expreſly ſaith, the Emperor did this (*u*): The Stories of *Juſtinian*'s revoking his Edict, and of *Theodorus* and *Mennas* humble ſubmiſſion delivered in writing to *Vigilius*, and of his abſolving them, are equally falſe and moſt improbable, ſo that ſcarce any thing here can be truſted. Were this Epiſtle genuine I would have obſerved, that Pope *Vigilius* here ſaith, he knew *Juſtinian*'s Hand-writing (*w*): And that utterly confutes *Baronius* and *Suidas*, who ſay, he was altogether *illiterate*. I would alſo note, That the Pope here affirms, (*An.* 551.) *he had been ſeven year out of his Country, attending for the Peace of the Church* (*x*): Now if this be true, he muſt leave *Rome An.* 544, that is, three years before *Baronius* his Account; and this will alſo prove ſome of his Epiſtles to *Auxanius* counterfeit, being dated from *Rome* after that time. But after all, I reckon this falſe account of the Pope's Journey, to be a ſign that this Epiſtle is a Forgery; only thoſe who count it genuine ought to ſolve theſe difficulties.

(*t*) Not. in Ep. 15. *Bin.* pag. 13. *Lab.* 337.

(*u*) *Liberat.* Brev. cap. 24.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 552. n. 15. pag. 388.

(*x*) Ap. *Lab.* 333.

There is nothing more in our Editors vere remarkable, but only ſome few French Councils, called by their own Kings, and the Canons in them made by their own Biſhops, without any notice of Papal Authority, and ſo without any Corruptions. Wherefore we paſs them, and go on to the Fifth General Council, where *Vigilius* will be brought on the Stage again.

An

An Epitome of Dr. Crakenthorp's *Treatiſe of the Fifth General Council at* Conſtantinople, Anno 553.

Lab. Tom. v. 422, 429. col. 2. 430.

Chap. i. THE occaſion of this Council, was the *Tria Capitula*, or *three Chapters* about the Writings of *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, and the Epiſtle of *Ibas* to *Maris*, which the Neſtorians pretended was all approved by the Council of *Chalcedon*; whereupon ſome doubted of the Authority of that Holy Council, and the ſeveral Sects (called from their having no one Head, *Acephali*) rejected it: So that to appeaſe this dangerous Schiſm, *Juſtinian* ſet forth an Orthodox Edict (*a*) to condemn thoſe Writings: And that not ſatisfying all Parties, he aſſembled this Fifth General Council.

(*a*) *Bin.* Tom. ii. par. 2. pag. 151. *Lab.* Tom. v. pag. 683.

Chap. ii. Pope *Vigilius* was then at *Conſtantinople*, and often deſired by the Biſhops, and commanded by the Emperor to be preſent (*b*): *Baronius* falſly ſaith, they *had no regard to him* (*c*); yet he afterwards owns twenty Metropolitans, and three Patriarchs invited him to come, and offered him the Preſidency (*d*), urging him with a Promiſe under his Hand to be there (*e*): *Vigilius* firſt pretended to be Sick, ſo they adjourned the

(*b*) *Bin.* Col. 1. 47, & 49. 2. & Col. 2. 51. 2.
(*c*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 399. *n.* 31.
(*d*) Id. n. 35.
(*e*) *Bin.* Col. 2. 51. 2. *Lab.* 430.

the firſt Seſſion, on his ſaying he would ſatisfie them next day (*f*). Then he alledged there were but few Weſtern Biſhops; but they ſhewed there were more with him at that time, than had been in all the four former Great Councils (*g*). He pretended alſo, he would offer his Senſe to the Emperor alone (*h*); but the Emperor required him to do it to the Council (*i*): So that the true reaſon why *he would not be there*, was, his Affection to the Neſtorians and the three Chapters.

(*f*) *Bin.* col. 1. 49. a.

(*g*) *Bin.* col. 2. 51. a. *Lab.* 430.

(*h*) *Bin.* & *Lab.* ibid.

(*i*) *Bin.* col. 1. 47. b. *Lab.* 422.

Chap. iii. Upon this the Council reſolves to proceed without him (*k*); which *Cuſanus* ſaith, ought to be done for the ſafety of the Church, when the Pope is reſolved not to come (*l*); and herein they follow the Example of the Council of *Chalcedon*, who proceeded without the Popes Legates, when they would not ſtay and join with them (*m*). Wherefore in the third Collation this *5th* Council declared the true Faith, and in the *4th* and *5th* examine the Cauſe of *Theodorus* and *Theodoret*: On the fifth day (ſaith *Baronius*,) Pope *Vigilius* ſent his Conſtitution to the Council (*n*), being made by the advice of 16 Biſhops and 3 Deacons, and deſigned to oblige the whole Church, the Weſtern agreeing with him in it (*o*), and delivered by *Apoſtolical Authority* (*p*): Wherein he confirms the three Chapters, declaring *1ſt*, That *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* cannot be condemned after his death (*q*). *2ly*, That *Theodoret*'s name ſhould not be taxed (*r*). *3ly*, That *Ibas* Epiſtle to *Maris* was Catholick, and both he and that Epiſtle received by the Council of *Chalcedon* as Catholick and Orthodox (*s*). But *Binius* cuts off the five laſt Columns (which are added by *Baronius* and *Labbè*,) and which ſhew how fully *Vigilius* confirmed all the three Chapters

(*k*) *Bin.* col. 2. 52. b. *Lab.* 434.

(*l*) *Cuſan* de concord. Cath. l. 2. c. 1.

(*m*) Conc. Chal. Act. 16. *Bin.* Tom. ii. pag. 1. 334. *Lab.* Tom. iv. 79. h.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 553. n. 41, & 48.

(*o*) Ibid. n. 47, & *An.* 547. n. 39.

(*p*) *Vigil.* Conſt. *Bin.* pag. 26. *Lab.* 376.

(*q*) *Bin.* 25. *Lab.* 366.

(*r*) *Bin.* ib. *Lab.* 367.

(*s*) *Bin.* 26. *Lab.* 369.

Chap. iv. In the 6*th* Collation the Council having received this Conſtitution, do notwithſtanding go on to examine *Ibas* Epiſtle (*t*): And wonder any dare preſume to ſay, it was received by the Council of *Chalcedon* (*u*); Which *Baronius* owns was levelled at *Vigilius*, though out of reſpect he be not named (*w*). And after a ſtrict Examination, They pronounce, that the approvers of this Epiſtle are Followers of *Theodorus* and *Neſtorius* the Hereticks; They ſhew the Council at *Chalcedon*, owns *God was made Man*, which this Epiſtle calls *Apollinariſm*; That Council confeſſes *Mary* to be the Mother of God, the Epiſtle denies it; They commend the Council of *Epheſus*, and *Cyril*'s twelve Chapters condemning *Neſtorius*; *Ibas* condemns the Council of *Epheſus*, defends *Neſtorius*, and calls *Cyril* an Heretick, and his 12 Chapters impious: They ſtuck to *Cyril*'s Faith and the Nicene Creed, he condemns *Cyril*'s Faith, and commends *Theodorus* his Creed: They held two Natures, but one Perſon in Chriſt; He is for two Perſons alſo (*x*): Whereupon this 5*th* Council Decree the whole Epiſtle to be Heretical, and Anathematize all as Hereticks who receive it (*y*). And for this reaſon *Binius* leaves out of his Edition the moſt of that part of *Vigilius*'s Conſtitution, which concerns *Ibas* his Epiſtle: And *Baronius* (who puts it in) with the *Neſtorians*, would excuſe it by ſaying the latter part of this Epiſtle is Orthodox: But the Council condemns the whole Epiſtle (*z*), and all that ſay any part of it is right (*a*); and all that write for it or defend it (*b*). So that Pope *Vigilius*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmine* and all the Writers for this Heretical Epiſtle, were and are accurſed by the Sentence of this General Council: And if (as *Baronius* pretends) the Popes Legates at *Chalcedon*, ſay, that *Ibas* appeared a Catholick by this *Epiſtle* (*c*); the 5*th* Council ſhews the Fathers at *Chalcedon* condemned it, *not heeding what two or three ſaid* (*d*). *Baronius* urges, (as the Neſtorians did,) *that* Eunomius *ſaid at* Chalcedon, *the latter end of* Ibas *Epiſtle was Orthodox* (*e*); but the 5*th* Council ſaith, this is a Calumny (*f*), and cite

(*t*) *Bin.* 88. *Lab.* 509.
(*u*) Ibid.
(*w*) *Baron. An.* 553. n. 212.
(*x*) In fine Col. 6. *Bin.* pag. 102. *Lab.* 544.
(*y*) Ibid.
(*z*) Col. 6. in fine.
(*a*) Col. 8. *Bin.* pag. 116. *Lab.* 579.
(*b*) Col. 8. *Bin.* pag. 115. *Lab.* 568.
(*c*) *Baron. An.* 553. n. 213.
(*d*) *Bin.* pag. 104. *Lab.* 548.
(*e*) *Baron.* ut ſupr.
(*f*) Col. 6. *Bin.* 91. a. *Lab.*

cite the very words of *Eunomius* out of the Council at *Chalcedon*; which import that *Ibas* was innocent, after he had agreed with *Cyril* and renounced his Epiſtle, which he had done in the *Acts* before *Photius* and *Euſtathius* (*g*). The 7*th* Collation of this 5*th* Council, was only repeating and approving former Acts (*h*). In the 8*th* Collation, *Baronius* owns this Council condemned the three Chapters *contrary to* Vigilius *Decree* (*i*), and Anathematize all that did defend them (*k*), that is, *Vigilius*, whom *Baronius* often commends as a defender of them (*l*): Yea, they declare them Hereticks, by the Doctrin of the Scriptures and holy Fathers, and of the four former Councils (*m*): All which therefore *Vigilius* contradicted in his Conſtitution. And whatever *Baronius* firſt ſays to diſparage this Council, it was ratified by the 6*th* Council (*n*), by the ſeventh, or ſecond *Nicene* Council, Act. 6. yea, (and as *Baronius* confeſſeth (*o*)), by all ſucceeding General Councils; by the Popes, *Pelagius*, *Gregory* the Great, *Agatho*, *Leo* the ſecond, and by all ſucceeding Popes, who were ſworn to obſerve all the General Councils, and this among others (*p*). To which we may add the Councils of *Baſil* and *Conſtance*, and all the Catholick Church till *Leo* the 10*th*'s Lateran Council, *An.* 1516, which *contrary to the Catholick Faith* (*q*) *decreed no Council could condemn a Pope*: Wherefore we may conclude, *Vigilius* was a condemned Heretick.

(*g*) Ibid.
(*h*) Col. 7. *Bin.* 104. *Lab.* 549.
(*i*) *Baron. An.* 553. n. 219.
(*k*) Col. 8. *Bin.* 115. *Lab.*
(*l*) *Baron. An.* 553. n. 233. *An.* 546. n. 40, &c.
(*m*) Coll. 8. ut ſupr. & *Bin.* 116. *Lab.* 179.
(*n*) Concil. 6. Act. 15.
(*o*) *Baron. An.* 553. num. 229.
(*p*) *Baron. An.* 869. n. 68, 69.
(*q*) Academia Pariſ. in Appellat.

Chap. v. Now let us examine *Baronius* his ſhifts, and thoſe *Binius* learns from him. Firſt, *they pretend this was not a point of Faith, but concerned only perſons* (*r*): Which is moſt falſe; For the Emperor *Juſtinian* calls it *a matter of Faith* (*s*); ſo doth the 5*th* Council it ſelf declare (*t*): Yea, *Vigilius* in his Conſtitution calls the condemning theſe three Chapters *Erring from the Faith*; and *Facundus* the Apologiſt for them ſaith, the oppoſing them was rooting out the Catholick and Apoſtolick Faith (*u*). On the other ſide Pope *Pelagius* ſaith, *they are contrary to the Faith, and to receive them is to over-*

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 547. n. 30. n. 46. n. 225. n. 231. Vid. item. *Bin.* not. in 5. Concil. pag. 374. *Lab.* 374.
(*s*) *Bin.* Col. 1. pag. 47. *Lab.* 422.
(*t*) Col. 8. ſæpiſſimè.
(*u*) *Baron. An.* 546. n. 47.

overthrow the Faith of Epheſus (*w*); which Epiſtle *Gregory* the Great confirms (*x*). *Bellarmine* ſaith, that is *de fide*, which a Council defines to be ſo, and calls the oppoſers of it Hereticks and accurſeth them (*y*). And *Baronius* calls the Emperors Edict for the three Chapters, *Sanctio de fide Catholica* (*z*), and *Fidei decretum* (*a*), So that it muſt be a matter of Faith: And *Gregory* the Great was miſtaken if he meant, *that this 5th Council handled no matters of Faith, but treated of Perſons* (*b*): For the contrary is manifeſt. But indeed *Gregory* means they altered no point of Faith eſtabliſhed at *Chalcedon*, as ſome in his time fancied; only condemning the perſons there examined; but ſtill it was by ſhewing they held notorious Hereſies.

(*w*) *Pelag.* 2. ep. 7.
(*x*) *Greg.* l. 2. ep. 36.
(*y*) *Bellarm.* de Concil. cap. 12. §. 4.
(*z*) *Baron. An.* 546. n. 41.
(*a*) Id. *An.* 547. n. 50.
(*b*) *Greg.* l. 3. ep. 37.

Chap. vi. But to conſider the three Chapters ſeverally: The firſt was about *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, who (as *Vigilius* ſaith (*c*),) ſhould not be condemned after he was dead, citing *Leo* and *Gelaſius* for it, as having decreed it for a point of Faith: But on the other ſide St. *Auſtin* declares, if *Cæcilian* were guilty of the Crimes objected (100 years after his death,) *he would Anathematize him* (*d*): *Pelagius* urges and approves of this Doctrin of St. *Auſtin*, and ſaith *Leo* argeed with him (*e*). The ſame is proved in the *5th* Council, to have been the Opinion of St. *Cyril*, of the African Council, &c. (*f*) Thus alſo *Domnus* was condemned at *Chalcedon* after his death, and many of the old Hereticks (*g*): *Honorius* was condemned by name ſixty years after his death (*h*). Yea, *Baronius* who urges this in excuſe of *Vigilius* in one place (*i*), in another declares that it is a miſtake, and that the Church of *Rome* doth condemn Men after their death (*k*); So as he is forced to commend and condemn the ſame Fact; and to excuſe this reaſon of *Vigilius*, he diſputes for both ſides of a Contradiction: As to our Saviours words, of *binding and looſing on Earth*, *Math* 18. which *Gelaſius* and *Vigilius* cite, they reſpect the living Miniſters on Earth, and not the Perſons bound or looſed: And *Leo* and *Gelaſius* both ſpeak of

(*c*) Conſt. *Vigil.* *Bin.* 25. *Lab.* 365.
(*d*) *Aug.* Ep. ad *Boniface.* citat. in Concil. col. 5.
(*e*) *Pelag.* 2. ep. 7.
(*f*) Col. 5. *Bin.* pag. 75. *Lab.* 479.
(*g*) Edict. *Juſt.* *Bin.* 164 *Lab.* 715.
(*h*) Concil. vi. Act. 12, 13 & 18.
(*i*) *Baron. An.* 553. num. 233.
(*k*) Id. ibid. num. 185.

looſing Perſons, who dyed Excommunicate and Impenitent, which they held unlawful; but neither of them ſay with *Vigilius*, That an Heretick, who is not diſcovered till after his death, and dyed in Hereſie, may not be condemned then.

Chap. vii. *Vigilius* pretends in the ſecond place, that this *Theodorus* dyed in the peace of the Church (*l*); which objection is taken notice of, both by *Juſtinian* (*m*) and the 5*th* Council (*n*), and largely diſproved by ſhewing he was condemned as an Heretick by all Churches, for that he dyed in his impiety; and the Council ſay it is *a Lye to affirm the contrary*: Wherefore *Baronius* falſly ſaith, Vigilius *knew he dyed in the Communion of the Church* (*o*). For even *Binius* ſaith, this cannot be believed, becauſe *Juſtinian*'s Edict witneſſeth the contrary (*p*), even that he dyed in Hereſie. So that unleſs an Heretick be in the Communion of the Church, *Theodorus* dyed not in that Communion.

(*l*) Conſt. *Bin.* pag. 25. *Lab.* 366.
(*m*) Edict. *Bin.* 164. *Lab.* 715.
(*n*) Collat. 5. *Bin.* 79. *Lab.* 490.
(*o*) *Baron. An.* 553. n. 49.
(*p*) *Bin.* not. in 5 Concil. pag. 374. *Lab.* 735.

Chap. viii. The Popes third reaſon is, *that neither the Fathers, nor Councils had condemned* Theodorus, particularly not *Cyril*, nor *Proclus*, nor the Synods of *Epheſus* or *Chalcedon* (*q*): But the 5*th* Council cites the very words of *Cyril* and *Proclus*, which declare him an Heretick and condemn him (*r*). They cite the words of *Cyril* to *John* of *Antioch*, in the Council of *Epheſus*, which ſay there were two Sons (*s*): Alſo *Cyril*'s Epiſtle approved at *Chalcedon* ſaith, the Council of *Epheſus* Anathematized not only *Neſtorius*, but all that taught as he did (*t*): And *Neſtorius* being *Theodorus* his Scholar, as the Emperor ſhews (*u*), the 5*th* Council doubts not to affirm he was condemned in the former great Council (*w*); So *Pelagius* the ſecond ſaith, *the Epheſine Council condemned* Theodorus *and his Creed* (*x*): *Vigilius* indeed denies it was his Creed; but *Cyril* ſaith it was his, and produced it under his name in the Council of *Epheſus*, and condemned it (*y*): So the not mentioning his name in the Anathema, is but a fallacious proof

(*q*) *Vigil.* Conſt. *Bin.* pag. 25. *Lab.* 364.
(*r*) Collat. 5. *Bin.* 76, &c. *Lab.* 483, &c.
(*s*) Ibid.
(*t*) Concil. *Epheſ.* Act. 1. c. 6. & *Chalced.* Act. 5. pag. 96.
(*u*) *Juſtin.* Ep. ad Synod. 5. *Bin.* 47. *Lab.* 421.
(*w*) Collat. 8. *Bin.* 115. *Lab.* 568.
(*x*) *Pelag.* 2. Epiſt. 7.
(*y*) Collat. 5. *Bin.* pag. 77. *Lab.* 486.

of

of his being not condemned there: But when the Nestorians began to shroud themselves under his name, then a Synod in *Armenia* condemned him by name (*z*), and *Proclus* exhorted them so to do as *Cyril* affirms (*a*), and *Cyril* there condemns him by name (*b*): So did *Theodosius* and *Valentiniam*, by their Edicts which the 5*th* Council cites (*c*). The Church of *Mopsvestia* put his name out of the Dypticks (*d*): And *Sergius* Bishop of *Cyrus* was deposed for reckoning his name among the Orthodox Bishops: Wherefore the 5*th* Council rightly declares, *That the Catholick Church had cast out* Theodorus *after his death, for his impious Writings* (*e*). But Pope *Vigilius* cites two forged Epistles of *Cyril* and *Proclus*, to shew that neither of them condemned *Theodorus* (*f*). And with the Nestorians he denies, that these Impious Writings were composed by *Theodorus* (*g*). But the Armenian Synod, St. *Cyril*, *Justinian* and the 5*th* Council, all say they were writ by *Theodorus*; the same is also affirmed by Pope *Pelagius* (*h*): As for what *Vigilius* objects, that the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon* were against condemning *Theodorus* after his death (*i*), *Liberatus* fortunes to say the same (*k*); And *Baronius*, who takes no notice of *Vigilius*, severely taxes *Liberatus* for this, as a Nestorian falshood charged on the Council of *Chalcedon* (*l*). And *Binius* saith, it is contrary to *Cyril*'s Writings (received at *Ephesus*,) and to the Acts at *Chalcedon* (*m*). Finally, *Vigilius* most falsly saith, the Emperor *Justinian* himself, as if he quoted the Acts of *Chalcedon* in his Edict for the Trinity, is for clearing *Theodorus* (*n*); which is so gross a slander as can scarce be paralleld. For *Justinian* in that very Edict condemns *Nestorius* and all that Teach with him (*o*); yea, he censures *Theodorus* by name in a particular Epistle, writ to this 5*th* Council (*p*): On these frivolous and false grounds *Vigilius* Decrees, none shall condemn *Theodorus* (*q*): But the 5*th* Council, without scruple justly condemns both him, and all that held with him or defended him, that is, Pope *Vigilius* for one.

(*z*) Collat. 6. Epist. *Ibas* & *Baron. An.* 435. n. 4.
(*a*), (*c*) Collat. 5. *Bin.* 77. *Lab.* 486, &c.
(*b*) Ibid.
(*d*) Collat. 5. *Bin.* 71. *Lab.* 471, 472
(*e*) Collat. 5. *Bin.* 84. *Lab.* 503.
(*f*) Ibid. *Bin.* 76. *Lab.* 483. & 78. & 487.
(*g*) *Vigil.* Const. *Bin.* 24, 25. *Lab.* 364, 365.
(*h*) *Pelag.* 2. Ep. 7. §. etsi.
(*i*) *Vigil.* Const. ut supra.
(*k*) *Liber.* Brev. cap. 10. *Bin.* pag. 182. *Lab.* 752, &c.
(*l*) *Baron. An.* 435. n. 11 & 12.
(*m*) Notis in Liberat. *Bin.* pag. 193. *Lab.* 779.
(*n*) *Vigil.* Const. *Bin.* pag. 25. *Lab.* 365.
(*o*) Edict. *Just.* de trin. Cod. l. 1. Tit. 1. *Lab.* 5. pag. 2.
(*p*) *Bin.* pag. 160. *Lab.* 706.
(*q*) *Vigil.* Const. ut supr.

Chap. ix.

Chap. ix. Secondly, *Vigilius* held the Heretical side as to the Writings of *Theodoret*, whose person after renouncing his former Heresie all agree to be Catholick; So that this is a point of Doctrin, not concerning a person. Yet first *Vigilius* pretends, *Theodoret* did not write these Papers against *Cyril*, alledged under his name, as (he saith) appeared to the Council at *Chalcedon* (*r*), which is most false; For *Binius* owns he writ against *Cyril*, and defended both *Nestorius* and *Theodorus* (*s*); and *Baronius* over and over confesseth the same thing (*t*): So doth *Liberatus*, cap. 4. and Pope *Pelagius* ep. 7. and the Councils both of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon* (*u*): Yea, *Theodoret* himself in his Epistles (cited in the 5*th* Council, and by Pope *Pelagius*) owns it (*w*); So that it is a wonder *Vigilius* durst urge so weak and false a thing: But he objects, The Council of *Chalcedon* only required him to renounce *Nestorius*, not to condemn his own Writings (*x*): Which is a meer fallacy, for he writ for *Nestorius*, and against *Cyrils* twelve Chapters: Now since he condemned all the Doctrins of *Nestorius* at *Chalcedon*, and also subscribed the twelve Chapters, he did really and virtually, though not by name, Anathematize his own Writings (*y*): Yea, *Pelagius* saith expresly, he did condemn his own Writings (*z*). And though at the Council of *Chalcedon* this General Condemnation sufficed, yet when the Nestorians in the time of *Justinian*, defended themselves by *Theodoret*'s Writings, it was necessary to condemn them expresly, and by name. Thirdly, *Vigilius* saith, *Cyril* on the Union with the Eastern Bishops, required none of them to renounce their own Writings (*a*): Which signifies nothing, since *Cyril* made them all Anathematize *Nestorius*, whose Cause they had defended before he would communicate with them (*b*). Wherefore *Vigilius* falsly concludes those Writings innocent, which so vigorously defend *Nestorius* his Doctrin; and if he and *Theodoret* vindicated these Writings, after they had condemned *Nestorius*, they contradict themselves, condemn

(*r*) *Vigil.* Const. *Bin.* pag. 25. *Lab.* 367.

(*s*) *Bin.* Præf. ad Concil. Eph. Tom. i. pag. 2. pag. 3. & notis in Epist. 61. *Leonis.*

(*t*) *Baron. An.* 427. n. 30. & *An.* 431. n. 182.

(*u*) Act. Concil. *Eph.* cap. 2. & cap. 8. The *Chalced.* Act. 1. cap. 6.

(*w*) Col. 5. *Bin.* pag. 72 & 85. *Lab.* 473 & 504.

(*x*) Const. *Vigil.* ut supra.

(*y*) Vid. Concil. *Chalced.* Act. 8.

(*z*) *Pelag.* Ep. 7. ut supra.

(*a*) *Vigil.* Const. *Bin.* pag. 26. *Lab.* pag. 367.

(*b*) *Cyril.* Ep. ad *Dynat.* in Concil. Ephes. c. 16.

demn only a name, but held the Heretical Doctrins ſtill: Which is plain alſo from *Vigilius* his affirming, That the Council of *Chalcedon* would have no Neſtorian Doctrins condemned under *Theodoret*'s name (*c*). That Council did condemn all that defended *Neſtorius*, of which theſe very Writings of *Theodoret* were the chief: But he there recanting his Errors, they condemned thoſe Errors, when they declared him Orthodox. And it was *Vigilius* favour for *Neſtorianiſm*, which makes him ſo Zealous for *Theodoret*'s Neſtorian Writings.

(*c*) *Vigil.* Conſt. *Bin.* pag. *Lab.* 367.

Chap. x. Thirdly, *Vigilius* held the Heretical ſide as to *Ibas* his Epiſtle, affirming that the Council of *Chalcedon* pronounced it to be Orthodox (*d*): But the *5th* Council expreſly ſay, the Council of *Chalcedon* did condemn and caſt it out (*e*). Again, *Vigilius* ſaith, the whole Council of *Chalcedon* agreed with *Paſcaſinus* and *Maximus*, who ſay that Ibas *by this Epiſtle was declared a Catholick* (*f*). Whereas the *5th* Council poſitively declare, that the diſcourſe of theſe two ſingle perſons, was not regarded at *Chalcedon* (*g*): And *Baronius*, after ſo many ſucceeding Popes and Councils had confirmed this *5th* Council, moſt impudently relates both theſe untruths, *viz.* That the Fathers of *Chalcedon* received this Epiſtle as Catholick, and that by it they did judge *Ibas* Orthodox (*h*); yet in contradiction to himſelf, he in other places (*i*) not only doubteth, whether *Ibas* did write this Epiſtle, but affirms expreſly, *it was found at* Chalcedon *not to be* Ibas *his Epiſtle*, citing for it the wretched Nicene Council for Images, where this and many falſe Stories are found: And after all, the Cardinal forgetting himſelf, ſaith elſewhere (*k*); The Council of *Chalcedon* ſaid it was his Epiſtle, and *Ibas* owned it to be his own, and *that it was well known to be the Epiſtle of* Ibas, and he cites the *10th* Act of the Council of *Chalcedon* to prove this, which he out of the very Acts of *Chalcedon* had denied before: Into ſo many confuſions and ſnares, doth

(*d*) *Vigil.* Conſt. *Bin.* pag. *Lab.* pag. 370.
(*e*) *Lab.* Concil. 5. col. 6. pag. 515. *Bin.* p.
(*f*) *Vigil.* Conſtit. ut ſupra.
(*g*) Concil. 5. ut ſupra.
(*h*) *Baron. An.* 553. p. & *An.* 448. p.
(*i*) *Baron. An.* 432. p.
(*k*) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 69. Et An. 553. pag.

doth he fall by labouring to defend this Heretical Pope.

Chap. xi. Whoſe frauds, with *Baronius*'s, will further appear if we obſerve, that the true General Council at *Epheſus* excommunicated *Ibas* (*l*), and the ſpurious Synod excommunicated *Cyril* (*m*): The Emperor *Theodoſius* to heal this breach, writes to *John* of *Antioch*, Patron of the Neſtorians, to condemn *Neſtorius* and agree with *Cyril* (*n*): And he at laſt with his Accomplices conſented ſo to do, Anathematizing *Neſtorius*, approving the Epheſine Council, and ſubſcribed *Cyril*'s Confeſſion of Faith (*o*), and ſo were received into the Peace of the Church, and an Union was made between them and *Cyril*: Now *Vigilius* and *Baronius* pretend, that *Ibas* in the end of his Epiſtle mentioneth this Union of *John* and *Cyril* with joy, therefore he was a Catholick when he writ it (*p*); and was ſo proved at *Chalcedon* by this Epiſtle, eſpecially by the latter end of it (*q*): But the 5*th* Council condemns the whole Epiſtle, and ſay the latter part of it is moſt impious (*r*). And they had good reaſon, for though *Baronius* pretend this Epiſtle was writ upon the Eaſtern Biſhops Union with *Cyril* (*s*); That is moſt falſe; for that Union was, *An.* 432, or 433, and *Rambulus* was then Biſhop of *Edeſſa*. But *Ibas* ſucceeded him, and mentions in this Epiſtle an Edict condemning *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia*, dated *An.* 435 (*t*); yea *Rambulus* was ſtill Biſhop of *Edeſſa*, and upon this Edict condemned *Theodorus*, ſo that *Ibas* could not write this Epiſtle till 2 or 3 years after the Union, being Biſhop of *Edeſſa* when he writ it (*u*): Yet then in this very Epiſtle he affirmed, God was not incarnate, nor *Mary* the Mother of God: So that the Union *Ibas* praiſes God for, muſt be that falſe Report ſpread by the Neſtorians of *Cyril*'s recanting, and yielding to *John* of *Antioch* (*w*): So *Theodoret* 12 years after the Union brags, that the *Eaſt* and *Egypt* were now agreed, that God was not crucified (*x*). And *Ibas* explains himſelf in this very Epiſtle

(*l*) Concil. *Epheſ.* cap. 7.
(*m*) Acta Conciliab. *Epheſ.* ibid
(*n*) Vid. in fine Con. Epheſin.
(*o*) Vid. Epiſt. *Cyril.* ibid.
(*p*) *Vigil.* Conſt. *Lab.* pag. 373. *Bin.* pag.
(*q*) *Baron. An.* 448. & *An.* 553. ut ſupr.
(*r*) Concil. 5. Col. 6. pag. 517. *Lab.*
(*s*) *Baron. An.* 448. n. 59. pag. 69.
(*t*) Epiſt. *Jo.* ad *Xyſtum* inter Act. Concil. Epheſ. *Bin.* T. 1. par. 2. pag. 421.
(*u*) Liberat. Brev. cap. 10. *Bin.* pag. 182. *Lab.* 752, &c.
(*w*) *Cyril.* Ep. ad *Donatum.* Concil. *Epheſ.* par. 3. Num. 38.
(*x*) Concil. v. Collat. 5. *Bin.* pag. 86. *Lab.* col. 508.

Epiſtle by ſaying, *God had ſubdued the Heart of the Egyptian to ſubſcribe*; *John* of *Antioch* ſaith, Yea, to the very Hereſie of *Neſtorius*, which this Author calls the Faith (*y*) in the latter end of this Epiſtle; by which *Baronius* ſaith he proved himſelf a Catholick (*z*): Yet *Baronius* owns this Story of *Cyril*'s recantation, was a vile calumny of the Neſtorians, who (as he pretends) forged this Epiſtle for *Ibas*, but it was found to be none of his (*a*); which is a ridiculous contradiction: And yet theſe ſhifts he is put to in juſtifying an Epiſtle, wholly condemned in the *5th* General Council. But to proceed, *Ibas* muſt relate to this feigned Union, becauſe the Neſtorians did at firſt require that *Cyril* ſhould recant his twelve Chapters (*b*), and by the propoſals of *Euſebius* Biſhop *Emiſa* made to him (*c*), which were in vain; and *John* of *Antioch* was forced at laſt by that Biſhop, to ſend his Submiſſion to *Cyril*'s Faith: To which ſecond meſſage *Cyril* indeed conſented, and thence the Neſtorians falſly ſaid he conſented to the firſt, and (as they requeſted) condemned his twelve Chapters; which remaining Orthodox, *Ibas* his Epiſtle muſt be Heretical, as it expreſſes a joy for *Cyril*'s ſuppoſed conſent to Neſtorianiſm.

(*y*) Ib. col. 6. *Bin.* 88. *Lab.* 511.

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 448. ut ſupr.

(*a*) Idem *An.* 432. pag. 625, 626.

(*b*) Concil. *Eph.* par. 3. Epiſt. *Cyril.* ad *Acacium. Bin.* pag. 431.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 422.

Chap. xii. The next Method which *Vigilius* and *Baronius* take to prove *Ibas* Orthodox, is by the Words of this Epiſtle, wherein he rejects *Cyril*'s twelve Chapters for teaching one Nature, and affirms, *Two Natures and One Perſon* (*d*). Now the Neſtorians could ſay this craftily like Catholicks, but their meaning was, that each Nature made a diſtinct ſubſiſtence, united only by Cohabitation, ſo that the Son of God dwelt in the Son of *Mary*; as may be collected from *Neſtorius* own words (*e*): And from *Juſtinian*'s Edict, where he ſaith, *for Perſon, they perfidiouſly uſed the word Natures* (*f*). But *Vigilius*, to clear *Ibas*, ſaith, *Dioſcorus* and the Pſeudo Epheſine Synod did condemn *Flavianus* for this Confeſſion of *Two Natures* (*g*). 'Tis replyed, they were all Eutychians who denied *two Natures in*

(*d*) Vid. Epiſt. *Ibæ* apud *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 2. pag. 88. *Lab.* Concil. 5. Collat. 6. pag. 509.

(*e*) Concil. 5. Collat. 6. *Bin.* pag. 103. *Lab.* 546.

(*f*) Edict. *Juſt.* poſt Concil. 5. *Bin.* pag. 161. *Lab.* col. 709.

(*g*) *Vigil.* Conſt. in *Lab.* col. 371.

all Senſes, and ſo might condemn theſe words, whether *Flavianus* the Catholick in a right Senſe, or *Ibas* the Neſtorian in a wrong, uſed them: And whereas *Vigilius* urges, that the Council of *Chalcedon* condemned *Dioſcorus* and received *Ibas* (*b*); 'Tis plain, they condemned his whole Epiſtle, as the 5*th* Council prove at large (*i*), and received him only after he had renounced the Doctrin of this Epiſtle: Again, *Vigilius* would juſtifie the Epiſtle by pleading, that *Ibas* owned the true Epheſine Council, before *Photius* and *Euſtathius* (*i*): But it was proved before that *Ibas* writ this Epiſtle, *An.* 434, and was then an Heretick; but the Acts before *Photius* were not till 14 years after (*k*); But his being a Catholick then, is no proof that his Epiſtle is Orthodox: Further, *Vigilius* ſaith, that *Ibas* miſtook *Cyril* till he explained his Chapters, after which he and the Eaſtern Biſhops ran into *Cyril*'s Communion (*l*). And *Baronius* ſaith, that he did communicate with *Cyril*, after he had purged himſelf of the ſuſpicion of being an Apollinariſt by declaring his Chapters (*m*): Yet *Baronius* himſelf owns, that *Cyril* explained his Chapters at *Epheſus*, while he was in Priſon there, *An.* 431 (*n*), while the Pſeudo-Synod ſat; and ſo their Title declares (*o*). But *Ibas* writ this Epiſtle above 2 years after this Explanation, and was then a *Neſtorian*: Nor did the Eaſtern Biſhops communicate with him till long after; and *Theodoret* writ bitterly againſt him, after that they were reconciled to *Cyril* (*p*). And *Binius* owns the difference between *Cyril* and the Eaſtern Biſhops, endured full three years after the Council (*q*); yet *Ibas* writ this Epiſtle after the Union was made, as the 5*th* Council expreſly declares (*r*): From all which it is plain that *Vigilius* miſtakes the point; for the Explanation *Ibas* meant of was *Cyril*'s abſolute revoking his twelve Chapters, (a Forgery of the Neſtorians) which in the Epiſtle he calls *his Recanting*; not this Orthodox Explanation of the twelve Chapters, as *Vigilius* pretends; yea, it was proved before *Photius* and *Euſtathius* that, *Ibas* ſaid, *He would not have received*

(*b*) Conſt. *Vig.* ibid.

(*i*) Concil. 5. Collat. 6. *Bin.* 104. *Lab.* col. 548.

(*i*) Conſt. *Vigil.* ut ſupra.

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 63. Tom. 6.

(*l*) *Vigil.* Conſt. ut ſupr.

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 66.

(*n*) Idem *An.* 431. pag. 595.

(*o*) Concil. *Eph.* par. 3. *Bin.* pag. 311.

(*p*) Epiſt. *Theodoret.* ad *Neſtor.* Concil. 5. Col. 5. propè finem. *Bin.* pag. 86.

(*q*) *Bin.* Præfatio ad Concil. Epheſ. Tom. 1. par. 2. pag. 4.

(*r*) Concil. 5. Collat. 6. *Bin.* pag. 90. *Lab.* 514.

received Cyril, if he had not Anathematized his Chapters (*s*). Wherefore *Ibas* his Epiſtle was always Heretical, and he an Heretick until he recanted and came over to *Cyril*'s Faith; but *Vigilius* falſly affirms him to have been Orthodox, both before he rightly underſtood *Cyril*'s meaning and afterwards (*t*), and wrongfully ſuppoſes *Cyril* came over to *Ibas*, who held two Perſons, but called them two Natures; from all which it manifeſtly appears, 1*ſt*, That the diſpute about this Epiſtle was a cauſe of Faith. 2*ly*, That *Ibas* his Epiſtle was Heretical. 3*ly*, That *Vigilius* and *Baronius* in this diſpute take the Heretical ſide.

(*s*) Concil. Chalced Act. x. *Bin.* pag. 289.

(*t*) *Vigil.* Conſt. *Lab.* Col. 371.

Chap. xiii. *Baronius* further pretends, that neither the aſſerting or denying theſe three Chapters, could denominate Men Hereticks (*u*): But this was fully diſproved before (ſee Chap. 5.) And ſince this was a cauſe of Faith, in which the whole 5*th* Council held contrary to Pope *Vigilius*, it will follow, that Men may contradict the Popes Deciſions in Articles of Faith, and be no Hereticks: Yea, ſince here the Pope was on the wrong ſide, they who are to believe all ſuch Deciſions muſt ſometimes be Hereticks. Secondly, *Baronius* falſly affirms, *that they who held contrary to the Pope herein, were Schiſmaticks Convict* (*w*). 'Tis true, there was a Schiſm, as he confeſſeth (*x*): But *Vigilius* and his Party were the Schiſmaticks, who ſeparated from a General Council, owned for ſuch by all Catholicks.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 358. Item *An.* 553. pag. 437.

(*w*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 358.

(*x*) Id. *An.* 553. Sæpiſſime.

Chap. xiv. In the next place, *Baronius* would excuſe *Vigilius* from Hereſie, becauſe he profeſſed to hold the Faith of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and writ his Conſtitution to defend it (*y*): So did *Victor* (*z*), ſo *Facundus Hermianenſis* (*a*), who writ for the three Chapters, pretend: Yea, *Vigilius* himſelf in his Conſtitution pretends to maintain the Faith of that great Council (*b*). But let it be conſidered, that the 5*th* General Council after a ſtrict examining all theſe pretences, Anathematizes all that defend the three Chapters in the

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 553 pag. 437, 438.

(*z*) *Victoris* Chron. *An.* 2. poſt Conſul. Baſil.

(*a*) *Facundus* ap. *Baron. An.* 546. pag. 344.

(*b*) *Vigil.* Conſt. *Lab.* col. 375.

name of the Council of *Chalcedon* (*c*), which Fact all Catholicks who approve this *5th* Council must consent to. And nothing is more usual with all sorts of Hereticks, than to profess they believe as the Orthodox Councils and Fathers have believed; yet they were condemned for all that pretence, (See particular instances of this, as to the Eutychians, Monothelites, Nestorians and Modern Romanists, in the learned Author (*d*)): Therefore *Baronius* his excuse is frivolous, since Hereticks professions are as false and contradictory as their Doctrins: And *Vigilius* would not forsake the three Chapters, no not when they were proved contrary to the Council of *Chalcedon*, and forbids any to write or speak against them, so as he might never be convicted or convinced.

(*c*) Concil. 5. col. 8. *Bin.* pag. 115. *Lab.* col. 568.

(*d*) *Crakenthorps Vigil. dormit.* chap. 14. pag. 201, &c.

Chap. xv. *Baronius* his third excuse for *Vigilius* is, that he confirmed the *5th* Council (*e*): And *Bellarmine* saith, he did confirm it (*f*): *Binius* adds, *no Man doubts it*: But if *Vigilius* case be examined, it will be found he changed four times in this Cause of Faith. First, While he was at *Rome*, upon *Justinian*'s first putting out the Edict, he opposed it (*h*), and stirred up *Facundus* a Nestorian to write against the Emperor in rude Language (*i*). Yea, *Baronius* in the same place Rails at *Justinian* for this Edict; and *Vigilius* writ a threatning Letter to *Constantinople*, against all that should joyn with the Emperor (*k*): So that *Vigilius*, *Facundus* and *Baronius* stand all Anathematized by the *5th* Council, for writing in defence of the three Chapters (*l*). But Secondly, As soon as *Vigilius* was come to *Constantinople* he changed his Mind, and in a Council of 30 Bishops condemned the three Chapters, which *Facundus* upbraids him with (*m*); and *Baronius* confesses he writ a Book against them, and sent it to *Mennas* Bishop of *Constantinople*; and that he excommunicated *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus* (two Roman Deacons,) with other defenders of the three Chapters (*n*); and in those Epistles writ about these Men, he calls this writing to *Mennas*, *his Constitution*, *his Judgment by* Peter's *Autho-*

(*e*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 438 & 439. Idem. *An.* 554. pag. 445.

(*f*) *Bell.* de Concil. l. 1. cap. 5.

(*g*) *Bin.* notis in Concil. 5. pag. 173.

(*h*) *Baron. An.* 546. pag. 343.

(*i*) Ibid. pag. 344.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 347.

(*l*) Concil. 5. Collat. 8. *Bin.* pag. 115.

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 359.

(*n*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 360.

Authority (*o*). For which the other Party called him a *Deſerter, a Prevaricator, &c.* (*p*); and *Victor* ſaith, that the African Biſhops in a Synod excommunicated him (*q*); yet *Baronius* owns theſe Biſhops at that time were Catholicks: Nor doth it excuſe this Pope, that he revoked this Conſtitution which condemned the three Chapters, preſently after it was publiſhed; and made another Decree, that all ſhould keep ſilence till the General Council (*r*). For this only ſhews him a Diſſembler, and a neutral in a Cauſe of Faith: But Thirdly, At the *5th* Council *Vigilius* returns to his Vomit, condemns the imperial Edict, and defends the three Chapters (as we ſhewed before (*s*)), and was ſo obſtinate as to endure Baniſhment for this Opinion (*t*), which (though none ſuffered for but ſuch as the *5th* Council declared Hereticks,) *Baronius* calls an heavy perſecution (*u*); and indeed his ſuffering on this ſide ſhews he was always a Neſtorian in his Heart: But Fourthly, *Binius* and *Baronius* ſay, he changed again after the *5th* Council, and condemning the three Chapters was enlarged, but died in his way home (*w*). Yea, they are confident that he did confirm the *5th* Council, (and ſo condemn his late Conſtitution (*x*)): Which laſt change no ancient Author mentions: And though this only could keep him from dying in Hereſie, yet this is a Fiction of *Baronius*, who will ſay any thing to ſave a Popes credit; an inſtance of which we have in his commending this *Proteus*, for a Man of Wiſdom and Conſtancy (*y*), and in *Binius* his praiſing *Vigilius* for a prudent and pious Pope, who imitated St. *Paul* in changing his Mind (*z*); while *Juſtinian*, who was always Orthodox and ſtood firm, is by theſe Paraſites decried as a wicked perfidious perſon (*a*): So that Truth in others is Error, and Error in a Pope is Truth, yea, if a Pope hold Contradiction, he is always in the Right.

(*o*) Concil. 5. Collat. 7. Ep. ad *Ruſtic.* & *Sabin.* & Epiſt. ad *Valentin.* ibid.

(*p*) *Baron.* ib. pag. 362.

(*q*) *Victoris* Chronicon. *An.* 10 poſt. Conſul. Baſ.

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 361.

(*s*) See Chap. iii. of this Hiſtory.

(*t*) *Bin.* not. in Concil. 5. pag. 174.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 435.

(*w*) *Bin.* notis ad Concil. 5. ut ſupr. pag. 174.

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 554. pag. 444, 445.

(*y*) Idem *An.* 547. pag. 362. & 361.

(*z*) *Bin.* notis ad Concil. 5. pag. 174. §. cum. *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 438, 439.

(*a*) *Baron. An.* 554. pag. 444.

Chap. xvi. But in this Account of *Vigilius* changes, two of them are forged by *Baronius*: First, that Decree of silence is a Fable, though it be so often mentioned in the Annals (*b*), and though he say *Vigilius* decreed this Synodically (*c*), and affirm that *Theodorus* and *Mennas* consented to it (*d*), and that he and *Justinian* had promised to observe this silence (*e*): Whereupon he pretends *Vigilius* excommunicated *Theodorus* and suspended *Mennas* (*f*); And stoutly opposing *Justinian*, who this year hung up his Edict in contradiction to this Decree of silence (*g*); though he fled to St. *Peter*'s Church, and then to *Chalcedon*, yet thence he thundred out his spiritual Darts against them all, and rescinded the Emperors Decree (*h*). Upon this *Baronius* says, the Emperor revoked his Edict, and *Theodorus* repented and submitted, as did also *Mennas*, and so all were content to be silent till the Council, and great Joy followed thereupon: Now this is all Fiction: For first, if there had been such a Decree for silence, let it be noted, *Domnus* was condemned at *Chalcedon* for an Heretick, in that he decreed silence should be kept about *Cyril*'s twelve Chapters (*k*). And by that Rule, *Vigilius* would have been Heretical for his Decree: Whereas the truth is, he never made any such Decree; for *Justinian* affirms, that from his first coming to *Constantinople*, until the Council, he always was for condemning the three Chapters (*k*); and as the Emperors messenger affirms, to the 5*th* Council then assembled, he often promised to joyn with them in it (*l*). Nor did *Vigilius* observe his own Decree, which is pretended to be made *An.* 547. the 21*st* of *Justinian* (*m*), and to have silenced all Disputes: For in the 22*d* year of that Emperor, the two Roman Deacons above named, accused *Vigilius* for condeming the three Chapters by their Letters to divers Bishops (*n*). In *Justinian*'s 23*d* year, *Vigilius* purges himself to *Valentinianus* from these Slanders, by appealing to his Judgment, sent unto *Mennas*, to which he declares he then adhered (*o*). In the Emperors 24*th* year, he writ the like Apology to *Aure-*

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 361.
(*c*) *An.* 551. pag. 382.
(*d*) *An.* 547. ut supr.
(*e*) *An.* 551. pag. 381.
(*f*) *An.* 551. pag. 384.
(*g*) Ibid. pag. 381.
(*h*) *An.* 552. pag. 387.
(*i*) Ibid. pag. 388, 389.

(*k*) Concil. 5. Collat. 6. *Bin.* pag. 103. *Lab.* col. 546. Edict. *Justin.* *Lab.* col. col. 718. *Bin.* pag. 165.
(*k*) Epist. *Justin.* ad Concil. 5. Collat. 1. *Bin.* 47. *Lab.* 422.
(*l*) Concil. 5. Collat. 7. *Bin.* 106. *Lab.* 549.
(*m*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 361.
(*n*) Idem: *An.* 548. pag. 363.
(*o*) Concil. 5. Collat. 7. *Bin.* 109. *Lab.* 557.

Aurelianus (*p*); and as *Baronius* proves, the ſame year he publiſhed his Sentence againſt *Ruſticus*, *Sabinianus*, and others for defending the three Chapters (*q*). Now how could he by word and writing, thus ſentence and puniſh all that diſliked his Condemnation of the three Chapters, and appeal to his Judgment in that caſe, if there had been a revocation of it, and a Synodal Decree of Taciturnity three year before? Nor did *Juſtinian* know of, or conſent to any ſuch Decree; for *Victor* ſaith, in his 22*d* year he writ for the Condemnation of the three Chapters, compelling divers Biſhops to condemn them (*r*). The next year the Illyrian Biſhops perſuaded the Emperor not to proceed ſo (*s*); ſo did *Facundus* in the 24*th* year; but he that year called the Council at *Mopſveſtia* to condemn *Theodorus* (*t*). In his 25*th* year, *Victor* and *Liberatus* declared, he dealt with the African Primates and Biſhops to condemn theſe Chapters; and got *Zoilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria* deprived for refuſing it (*u*), and in his 26*th* year (juſt before the Council,) he Baniſhed ſeveral obſtinate African Biſhops (*w*): So it is very ridiculous in *Baronius*, to ſpeak of the Emperor's publiſhing his Edict *An.* 25*th* (*x*), ſince it was publiſhed long before; and to pretend he revoked it the next year, ſince *Juſtinian* every year writ and acted in the defence of it: We add, that neither did *Theodorus* and the Catholicks obſerve this Decree of ſilence; for *Vigilius* ſentences them for writing againſt the defenders of theſe Chapters (*y*). No nor yet did the Hereticks value it; for they writ warmly for the three Chapters all that time (*z*): Yea, *Victor* notes, that the Illyrian Synod in the 23*d* year of *Juſtinian*, and the African in the 24*th* writ for the three Chapters (*a*). Well, but *Baronius* cites publick Acts for this Decree, and the ſubſequent agreement between *Vigilius* and *Mennas* (*b*): But theſe Acts are forged, being dated *An.* 25. *Juſtin. An.* 10. *poſt conſul. Baſil.* (*c*) where *Baronius* places the ſuſpenſion of *Mennas*, and his ſubmiſſion next year after (*d*): But *Mennas* died the 21*ſt* year of *Juſtinian*, that is, five year before, as

(*p*) Ibid. *Bin.* 109. *Lab.* 558.
(*q*) *Baron. An.* 550. pag. 375 & 380.
(*r*) *Victoris* Chronic. *An.* 7. poſt. Conſ. *Baſilij.*
(*s*) Ibid. *An.* 8.
(*t*) Concil. 5. Collat. 5. *Bin.* pag. 80. *Lab.* 492.
(*u*) *Victoris* Chron. ut ſupr. *An.* 10. *Liberat.* Breviar. cap. 23.
(*w*) Idem *An.* 11. id eſt, 26 *An. Juſtin.*
(*x*) *Baron. An.* 551. ut ſupr.
(*y*) Idem. *An.* 551 pag. 382.
(*z*) *Baron. An.* 548. pag. 364 & *An.* 550. initio.
(*a*) *Victor.* Chron. *An.* 8 & 9. poſt Conſul. *Baſilij.*
(*b*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 361.
(*c*) Idem *An.* 551. pag. 384.
(*d*) Idem. *An.* 552. ut ſupr. *An.* 26. *Juſt.*

the

the Popes Legates prove in the ſixth General Council (*e*), and by that ſhew theſe Publick Acts were forged; yea, *Baronius*, who here cites theſe Acts to colour over this Fable, there owns the Acts to be forged, and expreſly ſays, Mennas *certainly died in the* 21ſt *year of* Juſtinian (*f*). So that we may conclude this Decree of *Silence* and *Mennas* ſuſpenſion with the reſt, are a notorious Fable, invented only to ſave the Credit of Pope *Vigilius*.

(*e*) Concil. 6 Gen Act. 3. & *Bin.* not. ibid.

(*f*) *Baron. An.* 680.

Chap. xvii. And ſo is his confirming the fifth Council, either before or after his ſuppoſed Exile, which *Baronius* and others ſo boldly affirm (*g*): For that he did not confirm it neither during its Seſſion, nor ſoon after, *Baronius* proves, becauſe his Letters would then have been annexed to the Council (*h*). And he confeſſes the Reaſon moving *Pelagius*, the next Pope, to confirm it, was, That he found the Eaſtern Church in a Schiſm by *Vigilius* his Conſtitution (*i*), which could not have been if *Vigilius* in his Life had revoked that Conſtitution. Again, the Weſtern Church rejected the fifth Council all the time of *Vigilius*; for there could be found but two Weſtern Biſhops who would conſecrate *Pelagius* after he was choſen Pope, *becauſe he condemned the three Chapters* (ſaith *Victor* (*k*),) and as *Baronius* adds, becauſe they abhorred the fifth General Council (*l*); yea, a Council at *Aquileia* condemned the fifth Council *An.* 554 (*m*), urging that Pope *Vigilius* did not agree with it; and in this Opinion they remained till *Pelagius* the ſecond (20 years after *Vigilius* death and more, *An.* 577.) inſtructed them that the Apoſtolick Seat underſtanding the Controverſie better after *Vigilius* his time, had changed its Judgment (*n*), which Letter of this *Pelagius* is annexed to the fifth Council, and by *Binius* compared to the Epiſtle of *Leo* to *Flavianus* (o). Which Argument ſhews, that *Pelagius* never heard that *Vigilius* changed his Judgment, or confirmed the fifth Council. As to *Evagrius*, who (ſaith *Baronius*) with all the Greek Writers do affirm, that *Vigilius* by his Letters conſented to the Council, ſince he did not this during the

(*g*) *Baron.* & *Bin.* ut ſupr. cap. 15.

(*h*) Id. *An.* 553. pag 435, 436.

(*i*) Id. ib. p. 439.

(k) *Victor.* Chron. *An.* 17. poſt conſul. *Baſil.*

(l) *Baron. An.* 556. pag. 452. n. 1.

(m) *Beda* de 6 ætat. mund. An. 4637. *Sigon.* de reg. *Ital.* An. 554.

(*n*) Epiſt. 7. *Pelag.* 2. inter fragm. Conc. 5. *Bin.* pag. 123. *Lab.* Col. 615.

(o) *Bin.* Not. in 7 Epiſt. *Pel.* 2. pag. 257.

the Council, nor ſhortly after (being baniſhed), we muſt aſſert he conſented when he was freed from Exile (*p*): So the Cardinal. I Reply, This is very fallacious, for neither *Evagrius*, nor any Greek Writer, ſay any more, than *That* Vigilius *did by Letter conſent to the fifth Synod*——But *Evagrius* adds, ——*yet would not be preſent in it* (q). By which it is clear, the Hiſtorian means nothing but that conſent, which by word and writing he had often given, as to the Synods Opinion before they met, of which the fifth Council often complains, becauſe he denied it, and flew off afterwards (*r*); and it was theſe precedent Writings, that both *Nicephorus* (s) and *Photius* mean (*t*). Wherefore it is falſly done of *Baronius* to apply this to a ſubſequent Decree, for confirming the fifth Council after it was ended. *Baronius* his laſt Argument is, That ſince *Vigilius* was baniſhed for not conſenting to the fifth Synod, 'tis not likely he ſhould be releaſed till he had confirmed it (*u*). But firſt the conſequence is not good, for *Juſtinian* might reſtore him to gratifie ſo great a Subject as *Narſes*, and *Narſes* might intreat the Emperour to oblige the Roman Clergy, who then were Enemies to the fifth Synod. Secondly, (which is worſe) The whole ſtory of this Baniſhment and Releaſe is fabulous: For no Author but *Anaſtaſius* mentions this laſt Exile, who is very fabulous, and here much miſtaken; for he ſaith, *Pelagius* was preſent at this Releaſe, and then ſet free (*w*). Whereas *Victor*, who then was at *Conſtantinople* ſaith, *Vigilius* died in *Sicily* the 16*th* year after *Baſilius* his Conſulſhip (*x*), and that *Pelagius* was not re-called from baniſhment till the year after *Vigilius* his death, and ſo could not (as *Anaſtaſius* ſaith) be releaſed with him (*y*). Beſides, *Anaſtaſius* ſpeaks only of one baniſhment of *Vigilius*, for refuſing to reſtore *Anthimius*, near two years after his coming to *Conſtantinople*, in the life-time of *Theodora* (*z*), (who died *Anno* 548, according to *Baronius* (*a*)); and this is the baniſhment from which *Vigilius* was releaſed at the intreaty of *Narſes*, according to *Anaſtaſius*; and ſo both *Bellarmin*

(p) *Baron.* An. 553. pag. 435 & *An.* 554. pag. 444.

(q) *Evag.* hiſt. lib. 4. cap. 37.

(r) Concil. 5. collat. 1. *Bin.* 47 & 49. *Lab.* 422, & 425.

(s) *Niceph.* lib. 17. cap 27.

(t) *Phot.* de 7 Synod. in Concil. 7.

(u) *Baron.* An. 554. pag 445. n. 6.

(w) *Anaſtaſ.* apud *Baron.* *An.* 554. p. 444. n. 1.

(x) *Victor.* Chron. *An.* 16. (malè leg. 17.) poſt. conſul. *Baſil.*

(y) *Vict.* Chr. *Anno* 17. poſt conſ. *Baſil.*

(z) Vid. *Anaſtaſ.* vitâ *Vigilii.*

(a) *Baron.* An. 548. p. 369. n. 24.

(b) *Bellarm.* l. 4. de Pont. Rom. c. 10. *Sand.* de viſibil. Monar. lib. 7.

larmin and *Sanders* affirm from the Pontifical (*b*): Wherefore they and all Writers place this baniſhment of *Vigilius* divers years before the fifth Council, held *Anno* 553: So that the Exile after the fifth Council is a meer Forgery of *Baronius*, who openly contradicts his Author, as if he miſtook the time (*c*), only becauſe the real time of *Vigilius*'s Exile will not ſerve his deſign to excuſe the Pope from dying in Hereſie. He rejects a Story about *Vigilius*, told by *Anaſtaſius* as a manifeſt Lye, only becauſe neither *Facundus* nor *Procopius* mention it (*d*). By which Arguing it will appear, not only that *Vigilius* was not baniſhed after the fifth Council, but that he was not baniſhed at all, becauſe neither *Victor*, *Liberatus*, *Evagrius* nor *Procopius*, who then lived (and *Victor* is very particular in naming all that were exiled for this Cauſe) do not once mention *Vigilius* his being baniſhed, no, nor *Photius*, *Zonaras*, *Cedrenus*, *Glicas* nor *Nicephorus*. And *Platina*, with other Weſtern Writers take up this Fable upon the credit of *Anaſtaſius*, and *Baronius* improves it to ſerve a turn. But *Baronius* asks, If it be likely *Juſtinian* would ſpare *Vigilius* (e)? I reply, Yes; becauſe he was a weak and inconſtant man; and he having ſo great a Poſt, *Juſtinian* choſe rather to connive at him, than to harden others by puniſhing him, whom he repreſents to the fifth Council, as one who condemned the three Chapters; for which Reaſon alſo he is not condemned by Name in the 5*th* Council. Secondly, *Baronius* tells us of great Liberties, Gifts, &c. given to *Vigilius* upon his releaſe and ſending home, which he brings as a proof of his conſent to the fifth Council (*f*): Whereas that Sanction granting ſome Priviledges to *Italy* is dated in *Auguſt*, the 28*th* year of *Juſtinian*; and *Vigilius* (according to *Victor*, an Eye-witneſs) died not till the 31*ſt* of *Juſtinian*. So that theſe Liberties were promiſed to *Vigilius* and other Romans long before the Council, while *Vigilius* and the Emperour were very kind (*g*), *viz.* in the 23*th* of *Juſtinian*, but performed five year after; yet three years before *Vigilius* death, and ſo his dying before his return with

(c) *Baron.* An. 547. p. 357. n. 27. & An. 552. pag. 387. n. 8.

(d) Id. An. 546. p. 347. n. 54.

(e) *Baron.* An. 553. pag. 435. n. 222.

(f) Id. *An.* 554. pag. 445. n. 6. *Bin.* not. ad Concil. 5. p. 174.

(g) *Procop.* de bell. *Gothico*, l. 3.

with theſe Priviledges is a Fiction: But *Baronius* by meer gueſs, places it falſly in *Juſtinian's* 29*th* years beginning (*b*), only to colour the Fable. His laſt Argument is from *Liberatus* ſaying, *he died afflicted by the Eutychians*, but was not crowned (*i*). I reply, he deſpiſes *Leberatus* Teſtimony as to an Epiſtle of *Vigilius* (*k*): But *Liberatus* ſaith not, he was baniſhed or put to death for his Opinions; yea, he counts his condemning the three Chapters, Hereſie, and doth not tell us how he ſuffered or died, ſo that he is no Witneſs to this Fiction, but an Evidence againſt it.

(*b*) *Baron. An.* 554. initio.
(*i*) Liberat. Brev. cap. 22.
ap. *Baron. An.* 554. pag. 444. n. 5.
(*k*) Idem. *An.* 538. pag. 277.

Chap. xviii. *Baronius*'s laſt exception is, that this was no lawful General Council, nor had any Authority till *Vigilius* confirmed it (*l*): And *Binius* ſaith, his Sentence gave it the Title of a General Council (*m*). But we have ſhewed before, this was a lawful General Council received by the whole Catholick Church (*n*): Now they grant it was not confirmed till after it was parted, and that it was never gathered by the Holy Ghoſt; ſo that his Act afterwards cannot make a nullity valid: The Cardinal and *Binius* (*o*) both tell us, it was no General Council at firſt, being called though the Pope reſiſted and contradicted it; yet *Binius* had ſaid before, Vigilius *called the* 5th *Council by his Pontifical Authority* (*p*). *Baronius* alſo ſaith, the *Emperor called it according to the ſentence of* Vigilius (*q*): And the Council charge *Vigilius* with *promiſing in writing to meet with them* (*r*); and his own Letter printed there, declares his conſent to the aſſembling this Council (*s*). Yet if he had oppoſed it, ſo did *Damaſus* the ſecond Council at *Conſtantinople*, which was held (*repugnante Damaſo* (*t*)), yet is accounted a lawful General Council; and *Cuſanus* ſaith, *if the Pope be negligent or refractory, the Emperor may call a General Council* (*u*). And though he was not perſonally preſent in this Council, yet he ſent his Conſtitution, which was his Decree, *ex Cathedra* (*w*). But ſaith Baronius, *their ſentence was contrary to the Popes Decree*, and therefore it cannot be a lawful General

(*l*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 434. n. 224. *An.* 553. pag. 399. n. 29.
(*m*) *Bin.* notis in Con. 5. pag. 173. Col. 1.
(*n*) Supr. chap. 4.
(*o*) *Baron.* & *Bin.* ut ſupr. (*l*)
(*p*) *Bin.* notis in Con. 5. initio pag. 171.
(*q*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 398. n. 23, 24.
(*r*) Concil. 5. Collat. 2. *Bin.* pag. 51. *Lab.* 430.
(*s*) Ibid. Collat. 1. Epiſt. *Vigil.*
(*t*) *Baron. An.* 381.
(*u*) *Cuſan.* de Concord. lib. 3. ch. 15.
(*w*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 403. n. 47.

neral Council (x). *Bellarmine* also urges this for a Rule (y), but the matter of Fact sufficiently confutes them, since this Council which did Decree contrary to the Popes Sentence, is and was always held lawful. So was the second General Council good and valid, being confirmed by an imperial Edict in *July*, *An.* 381 (z), though *Damasus* did not so much as hear of it, till after the Council of *Aquileia* held in *September* that year (a); and it seems by Pope *Gregory*, that the Roman Church till his time had not received the Canons of it (b). Yea, the third Canon which *Damasus* and *Leo* (c) both condemned, and which *Binius* saith, *the Roman Church rejects to this day* (d); Yet all the while it was held Authentick, and by it *Anatolius* held the second place at *Chalcedon*, and *Eutychius* in the 5*th* Council; by it St. *Chrysostom* deposed and ordained Bishops, and held a Council in *Asia*: So that both Canons and Custom had setled this Rule, as is proved in the Council of *Chalcedon* (e). And *Justinian* made those Canons of this second Council to be inserted into the Dypticks, and to be read in Churches (f): So that Canons are good and valid, without the Popes Approbation, as well as Councils, whose Decrees have their force from the Subscriptions of the major part of Bishops there present (g), though two of the Popes Legates (h), or ten others did dissent (i), especially when the Emperor confirms them by his Edict, as *Constantine* did those of *Nice*, *Theodosius* those of the second General Council, &c. In like manner *Justinian* confirmed this 5*th* Council: And so it was valid without the Popes consent; though absent Bishops, (others as well as those of *Rome*,) were desired to confirm a Council after it was past, not to give any new Authority to it, but to preserve Unity, and to shew the Orthodoxy of these absent Bishops.

(x) Id. ibid. pag. 434.
(y) *Bellar.* de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11.
(z) *Baron. An.* 381. num. 80. pag.
(a) Id. ibid n. 97. pag.
(b) *Greg. M.* lib. 6. Epist. 31.
(c) *Turrian.* de 6, 7 & 8 Synodis pag. 65.
(d) *Bin.* notis in Concil. *Constantinop.* 2.
(e) Concil. *Chal.* *ced.* Act. 16. *Bin.* Tom. 2. par. 1. pag. 333.
(f) Novel. 131 cap. 1, 2.
(g) *Euseb.* de vitâ *Constant.* l. 3. c. 13. Digest. lib. 5. *Lab.* 19.
(h) Concil. 5. Col. 6.
(i) Concil. *Chal.* Act. 4.

Chap. xx. Omitting the 19*th* Chapter, which treats of General Councils at large, we proceed to *Baronius* leſſer and remoter objections againſt this Council: He begins with *Juſtinian* who called and confirmed it, whom he taxes 1*ſt* for want of learning, calling him an illiterate man who could not read a Letter (*k*), for which he cites *Suidas*, a late fabulous, yea an Heretical Author (*l*); But *Platina* commends *Juſtinian* for his great Learning and Wit (*m*). So alſo *Trithemius* who with *Poſſevine* reckon him among Eccleſiaſtical Writers (*n*). Pope *Agatho* and the 6*th* Council cite him as one of the venerable Fathers and Witneſſes of the Truth (*o*): *Liberatus*, an Enemy of his mentions his writing a Book againſt the *Acephali* (*p*). *Procopius* ſpeaks of his great diligence in reading the Chriſtian Writings (*q*): So that *Gotofred* in his Preface to the Inſtitutes ſhews, this is a meer a Calumny of *Suidas*; but *Baronius* greedily repeats it over and over, of pure malice to this learned Emperor. His ſecond Quarrel at him is, for preſuming to meddle in Cauſes of Faith, and making Laws for Prieſts (*r*). But did not all the Religious Kings of *Judah* do ſo? Did not *Conſtantine*, the two *Theodoſij* and *Martin* the ſame? And the 5*th* Council highly commend him for it (*s*): The Code of *Theodoſius*, his Code and the Authenticks ſufficiently prove this was done by the beſt of Princes. Thirdly, He reproaches him for his ſacrilegious Fury, in perſecuting *Vigilius* (*t*). Now I have proved before this beating and baniſhing of the Pope is a meer Fable (*u*); and if he was perſecuted, or rather puniſhed it was for Hereſie; and *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius* the elder and younger, and *Martian* are commended for the ſame Acts againſt the Arrians, Macedonians, Neſtorians and Eutychians, and St. *Auguſtin* juſtifies this proceeding (*w*). Fourthly, He charges him with falling into the Hereſie of the *Incorrupticolæ* in his laſt days, writing an Edict for it, and madly perſecuting all the Orthodox, eſpecially *Eutychius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*

(*k*) *Baron. An.* 528. pag. 139. n. 2. *An* 538. pag. 281. n. 32. *An.* 546. pag. 344. n. 41. *An.* 551. pag. 382. n. 2. & 4.

(*l*) *Poſſevin.* Apparat. verbo *Suidas.*

(*m*) *Platin.* vit. *Bonif.* ſecundi.

(*n*) *Trithem.* lib. de Script. Eccleſ.

(*o*) Concil. 6. Act. 4. in Epiſt. *Agath.*

(*p*) Lib. brev. cap. 24.

(*q*) *Procop.* l. 3. de bell. *Goth.*

(*r*) *Baron. An.* 528. pag. 139. *An.* 551. pag. 382. *An.* 553. pag. 439. n. 237

(*s*) Concil. 5. Collat. 7. in fine *Bin.* 111. *Lab.* 561.

(*t*) *Baron. An.* 551. pag. 382. n. 2. *An.* 552. pag. 387. n. 8. *An.* 553. pag. 435.

(*u*) See Chap. 16 & 17.

(*w*) *Aug.* lib. contr. *Fulgent.* Donat. c. 20.

ſtantinople for oppoſing it, for which he Rails intollerably at him, ſaying all Authors, Greek and Latin atteſt this (*x*): Finally he dooms him to Hell for this (*y*). But firſt, *Juſtinian* did not publiſh ſuch an Edict as *Evagrius* and *Nicephorus*, his two main Witneſſes atteſt (*z*); and *Baronius* owns as much: And *Victor* Biſhop of *Tunen*, who ſuffered (under *Juſtinian*) Impriſonment, and ſpeaks hardly of him, is ſilent as to this Edict; but ſhews he continued conſtant to his Edict againſt the three Chapters to his very death (*a*), wherein he owns all the former General Councils: And it is ſo far from truth, that *all Writers, Greek and Latin charge him with that Hereſie, that neither* Procopius, Agathus, Victor *nor* Liberatus *do it, nor* Damaſcen, *though he treat of this Hereſie* (*b*), *nor* Marcellinus, Bede, *nor* Anaſtaſius: *Suidas* ſaith, he was *moſt Orthodox*; Aimonius *and* Paulus Diaconus *affirm*, he was *for his Faith a Catholick* (*c*): And twenty other eminent Writers (cited by this Author), do all give him a great Character; and Pope *Gregory* (*d*) with many others after his death, beſtow on him the Title *of Pious and of ſacred Memory*. *Baronius* names but three Authors for this Slander: Firſt, *Nicephorus*, whom *Poſſevine* calls *Heretical and Erroneous in Hiſtory* (*e*); and the Cardinal in this Relation judges him to be *a Fool* (*f*), and generally he is but *Evagrius* his Ape. His ſecond Witneſs is *Euſtathius* (*g*): But *Surius* is generally ſtuffed with fabulous Writers, and ſuch is this *Euſtathius* falſly pretended to have writ *Eutychius* his Life; for neither *Photius*, *Trithemius*, *Poſſevine* nor *Sixtus Senenſis* mention any ſuch Writer: And the Story is full of Lyes; for he makes *Eutychius* to come to *Conſtantinople* to the *5th* Council, and then to be choſen Biſhop after *Mennas* death, who died five years before this Council (*h*); And this *Eutychius* was choſen full four years before it: And he reckons that *Eutychius* was Baniſhed twelve years (*i*), whereas two years after his Baniſhment he crowned *Juſtinius* (*k*), and was actually Patriarch when *Juſtinius* was ſick, and nominated *Tiberius* his aſſociate

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 563. pag. 483. 484, 485. n. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8. Et *An.* 564. pag. 487. & paſſim.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 565. pag. 497, &c. n. 6.

(*z*) *Evagr.* Hiſt. l. 4. c. 40. *Niceph.* lib. 17. c. 30.

Baron. An. 565. pag. 496.

(*a*) *Victor* in Chron. *An.* 38. *Juſtin.*

(*b*) *Damſacen.* lib. de Hæreſ.

(*c*) *Aimon.* de geſt. Franc. lib. 3. c. 8. *Paul. Diac.* de geſt. Lang. l. 1. c. 25.

(*d*) *Greg. Mag.* lib. 2. indic. 11. Ep. 10. & lib. 3. Ep. 4.

(*e*) *Poſſevin.* in verb. *Nicephorus.*

(*f*) *Baron. An.* 563. pag. 484. n. 8.

(*g*) *Euſtath.* ap. *Sur.* 6. Aprilis.

(*h*) See before Chap. 16.

(*i*) *Baron. An.* 564. pag. 493. n. 29.

(*k*) Hiſtor. Miſcel. lib. 16.

aſſociate (*l*), and ſo could not (as this Fabler pretends,) be deſired from Baniſhment after *Tiberius* Reign began with *Juſtin* (*m*); yet to make out this Lye, *Anaſtaſius* his latine Verſion of *Nicephorus* adds ten years to *John* Succeſſor of *Eutychius*, and makes him ſit twelve year and ſeven Months (*n*), who in *Nicephorus* ſat but two years and ſeven Months. 'Tis true, *Eutychius* was Baniſhed by *Juſtinian*, but it was for Propheſying of his Succeſſors (*o*), and for holding the Hereſie of *Origen* as Pope *Gregory* witneſſeth (*p*), againſt which *Juſtinian* had put out an Edict, and which was ſentenced in the 5*th* Council (*q*). And it was for oppoſing this Edict, not an Heretical Edict that *Eutychius* was Baniſhed: So that thirdly, *Baronius* hath no Author for this Slander of *Juſtinian*'s being an Heretick, but *Evagrius*, who is owned by all to be a moſt fabulous Author, (as is proved in the Hiſtory here very fully by many inſtances;) Now what is his credit againſt ſo many truer and better Hiſtorians? Finally, Whereas *Baronius* reviles *Juſtinian* as a deſtroyer of the Empire and the Church, This Author largely proves out of the beſt Hiſtorians, that *Juſtinian* was a Wiſe, Pious and Victorious Prince, the beſt Emperor as to his Laws, his Buildings, his Wars, and his Love to Religion that ever ſat on the Throne Imperial, to which the Reader is referred (*r*).

(*l*) *Zonar.* Tom. 3. vit. *Juſtin.*
(*m*) *Baron. An.* 578. pag. 567. n. 5.
(*n*) Idem. *An.* 564, 493. n. 29.
(*o*) *Baron. An.* 578. pag. 566. n. 2.
(*p*) *Greg. Mag.* lib. 14. Moral. chap. 29.
(*q*) *Liberat.* Brev. cap. 24. *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 281. n. 33. & in Concil. 5.
(*r*) See *Crakenthorp's Vigilius* dormit. cap. 20. pag. 349, &c.

Chap. xxi. In like manner the Cardinal reviles *Theodora* the Empreſs, as *a Wicked, Heretical, Sacrilegious, Mad Woman, ſtrook with death by Heavens vengeance upon* Vigilius *Excommunicating her* (*s*). But other Authors ſay, ſhe was like her Husband in her Studies and Manners (*t*): Yea, the Emperor gives her an excellent Character in his very Laws (*u*): He alſo (*w*), and the 6*th* Council after her death, call her *a Woman of Pious Memory* (*x*). Nor ought *Baronius* to revile her for thruſting *Anthimius* an Heretical Monſter into the See of *Conſtantinople*, as he doth (*An.* 535. pag. 226. *ut ſupr.*) ſince there he owns, that at his Election he

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 535. pag. 226. n. 59, 60. *An.* 536. pag. 268. n. 123. *An.* 538. pag. 275. n. 9. *An.* 548. pag. 369. n. 24.
(*t*) *Conſtantin. Manaſ.* Annal. pag. 87.
(*u*) *Juſtin.* novel. 8. cap. 1.
(*w*) *Prag.* ſanct. c. 1.
(*x*) Concil. 6. Act. 3. & Act. 4.

he ſeemed a Chatholick, and that ſhe favoured him as Orthodox (*y*); yea, he carried it ſo as to ſeem ſuch to all (*z*). As to her contending with *Vigilius* two years about the Reſtitution of *Anthimius*, which *Baronius* relates, (*An* 547. pag. 357.) it is a meer Fable, for that Cauſe of *Anthimius* was determined long before; and *Victor* ſaith, that *Vigilius* and *Theodora* agreed after he came to *Conſtantinople*, and that ſhe perſuaded him to condemn the three Chapters (*a*). And he (who beſt knew) ſaith, it was Pope *Agapetus* who excommunicated *Theodora*, (then favouring the Acephali) (*b*): So that *Vigilius* is by the Scribes miſtake, put for *Agapetus* in *Gregory* (*c*), as appears by his ſpeaking of the taking of *Rome* by the Goths immediately after, which was the Sacking it by *Vitiges* after *Agapetus* his time, or by *Totilas*, which was (not after, but) before this pretended Sentence of *Vigilius* againſt *Theodora*, *viz.* that year *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople* (*d*). From all which it is manifeſt, that this Pope did never Excommunicate *Theodora* at all, who in her latter Days was Orthodox, but hated by the Neſtorians, for joyning with *Juſtinian* in condemning the three Chapters, which alſo raiſes *Baronius* his ſpleen againſt her.

(*y*) *Baron. An.* 535. pag. 227.
(*z*) Ibid. pag. 233. n. 86.
(*a*) *Victoris.* Chronic. *An.* 2. poſt. Conſ. *Baſ.*
(*b*) Idem in Chron. in Conſ. *Juſtiniani. An.* 14. ejus Regni.
(*c*) *Greg. Mag.* lib. 2. Ep. 36.
(*d*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 353 & 356.

Chap. xxii. His next attempt is againſt the three Chapters, which he wiſhes had been condemned to Eternal ſilence, buried and extinguiſhed (*e*), adding it had been better for the Church they had never been ſpoken of (*f*), *viz.* becauſe of the Troubles enſuing: I reply, ſo there was about the words ὁμοούσιος & ὁμοιούσιος: But this ſettled the true Faith, as it did alſo that Controverſie, and (by Providence) ſhews us, that a Pope may Err in matters of Faith.

(*e*) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 362. n. 48.
(*f*) *An.* 553. pag. 439. n. 237.

Chap. xxiii. After this he Rails at the Edict, calling it a Seed plot of diſſention (*g*), and ſaying it was contrary to the three Chapters of the Council of *Chalcedon*; and (as *Facundus* affirms,) contrary to *Juſtinian*'s own Faith, and writ by Hereticks (*h*); and the Cardinal ſaith it was writ by *Theodorus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* (*i*); againſt whom he every where Rails as a Factious and Schiſmatical Man, yea, an Heretick, and obſtinate Origeniſt (*k*), a moſt wicked Wretch, and a plague to the whole Church (*l*): But as to the Edict, it is in defence of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and to ſay otherwiſe, is to condemn the 5*th* General Council, who often declare as much: Yea, *Baronius* elſwhere in contradiction to himſelf ſaith, this Edict is *a Confeſſion of* Juſtinian's *right Faith, a Catechiſm and exact declaration of the Catholick Faith* (*m*). And he might as well call the Decrees of *Nice*, or other General Councils Seed-plots of diſſention; yea, the Goſpel it ſelf may be ſo calumniated (*n*): Nor do *Liberatus*, *Facundus* and *Vigilius* (as he ſaith,) declare that *Theodorus* writ this Edict (*o*); *Liberatus* only ſaith, he ſuggeſted it to the Emperor, to *condemn the three Chapters by a Book*, to be dictated by the Emperor, which he promiſed to do (*p*): *Facundus* names not *Theodorus*, but ſaith, *They were willing to believe it was writ by the Adverſaries of the Truth* (*q*); which was but a conjecture, and is as falſe as what he next ſpeaks of it, being contrary to the Emperors own Faith. And *Vigilius* words cited by *Baronius* (rightly conſtrued) ſhew only, that when the Edict was read in the Pallace, *Theodorus* required the Biſhops to favour it by his words (*r*); however this paſſage is taken out of a forged Epiſtle of *Vigilius* (*s*), wherein *Mennas* is ſaid to be excommunicated the 25*th* year of *Juſtinian*, who died the 21*ſt* year of that Emperor: So that none of his Evidence do prove, that *Theodorus* writ this Edict: And for his oppoſing *Vigilius* his Decree of ſilence, we ſhewed before there was no ſuch Decree (*t*), nor could he lead *Juſtinian* into the Hereſie of the

(*g*) *Baron. An.* 534. pag. 199. n. 21.
(*h*) Id. *An.* 546. pag. 336. n. 8, 9.
(*i*) Id. ibid.
(*k*) *Baron. An.* 551. pag. 381. 382 & alibi.
(*l*) Id. *An.* 564. pag. 488.
(*m*) *Baron. An.* 534. pag. 199. n. 21.
(*n*) Luke xii. 49, 51.
(*o*) *Baron. An.* 546. pag. 336. n. 8, 9.
(*p*) *Liberat.* breviar. cap. 24.
(*q*) *Facundus* apud *Baron. An.* 546. ut ſupr. (*o*)
(*r*) *Vigil.* ap. *Baron.* ibidem.
(*s*) Vid Ep. ap. *Binium.* Tom. 2. par. 2. pag. 12. *Lab.* col. 334.
(*t*) See Chap. 16.

Incorrupticolæ, becauſe the Emperor never held it (*u*), and his only Witneſſes, that *Theodorus* was an Origeniſt Heretick, are *Facundus* and *Liberatus*: Now *Facundus* is an Heretick, condemned by the 5*th* General Council, for writing in defence of the three Chapters, and a malicious Enemy of *Theodorus* (*w*): And ſo was *Liberatus*, for which cauſe *Bellarmine* (*x*), *Baronius* (*y*) and *Poſſevine* (*z*) adviſe us to read him cautiouſly, eſpecially in ſuch things as he borrowed from the Neſtorians, and what he ſaith of the 5*th* Council, *Profeſſæ inimicitiæ ſuſpicionem habent mendacij* (*a*). And this is certainly ſo, for how could he hold *Origen's* Hereſies, who ſubcribed the 5*th* Council wherein *Origen* is by name condemned (*b*)? And among other Biſhops, no doubt he had ſubſcribed *Juſtinian's* Edict againſt *Origen's* Errors (*c*), otherwiſe he could not have been ſo familiar with the Emperor, nor ſo beloved by him as *Liberatus* (the Author of this Calumny) reports him to have been: So that *Theodorus* was always Orthodox, and his adviſing this Edict is no proof it was againſt the Faith.

(*u*) See Chap. 20.

(*w*) Vid. *Poſſevin.* Appar. verbo (*Facundus.*)

(*x*) *Bellarm.* de Concil. l. 1. c. 5.

(*y*) *Baron.* ap. *Bin.* notis in *Liberat.* brev. pag. 193.

(*z*) *Poſſevin.* apparat. verbo (*Liberatus.*)

(*a*) *Hieron.* contr. *Ruffin.* Apol. 1.

(*b*) Concil. 5. Collat. 8. Art. xi. *Bin.* 116. *Lab.* 575.

(*c*) Ap. *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 293.

Chap. xxiv. *Baronius* and *Binius* do attempt after this to queſtion the Acts of the 5*th* Council, not indeed in any main thing concerning their not condemning, or *Vigilius* not defending the three Chapters (which is our Point,) but in leſſer matters, ſuch as may be objected againſt all the General Councils in the World (*d*); which therefore if the objections were true, would not take away the Authority of this General Council, whoſe Acts are as well preſerved as any, and better than any of the other Councils, except *Chalcedon*, that went before it.

(*d*) See inſtances in the Author. *Vigil. dorm.* pag. 178. c. 24.

Chap. xxv. The firſt Corruption they charge theſe Acts with is, that they add to the Acts of *Chalcedon* (in reciting them) theſe words—*which Jeſus Chriſt our Lord is one of the Trinity, which words ſome (ſuſpected of Eutychianiſm,) would have added to the Council of* Chalcedon, *but could not obtain it* (*e*). But firſt, it was no Eutychian

(*e*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 433. n. 214.

tychian Heretick who firſt ſaid *Chriſt was one of the Trinity. Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* denied it (*f*), but *Proclus* who was Orthodox, affirmed it, and taught it in an Epiſtle, approved in the Council of *Chalcedon* (*g*); and *Juſtinian* ſet out an Edict for it againſt the Neſtorians, who denied it, wherein he alſo Anathematizes the Eutychians (*h*); which Edict Pope *John* the ſecond confirms, and declares to be agreeable to the Apoſtolick Doctrin, and to the Faith of the Roman Church (*i*). Wherefore thoſe Monks, who affirmed one of the Trinity was Crucified could not be Eutychian Hereticks, as *Baronius* falſly ſays (*k*). But *Baronius* is a Neſtorian, who denies this Truth. And thoſe Monks did not ſeek to add it to the Council of *Chalcedon*, only they declared (againſt the Neſtorians,) this was the Senſe of that Council, in the time of *Hormiſda*, (who was Heretical in denying it,) nor doth the *5th* Synod recite it as the words of the Council of *Chalcedon*, but as their own words (*l*), who were as Orthodox as any in the Council of *Chalcedon*, and he is a Neſtorian who denies it.

(*f*) *Dionyſ.* Exig. in Præf. ad Epiſt. *Procl.* Bib. patrum. Tom. iii.

(*g*) *Juſtin.* Leg. 7. de ſum. Trin. c. 4.

(*h*) *Baron. An.* 533. pag. 180, 181. n. 7, &c.

(*i*) Idem *An.* 534. pag. 198. num. 15.

(*k*) Idem. *An.* 519. pag. 43 & 44, &c.

(*l*) Concil. 5. Collat. 6. *Bin.* pag. 102. *Lab.* col. 545.

Chap. xxvi. *Baronius* objects, Secondly, That in theſe Acts, *Ibas* is ſaid to have denied the Epiſtle to *Maris* to be his, which he ſaith is falſe (*m*), and *Binius* calls it *a Lye* (*n*); and they both give this as an inſtance of the Corruption of theſe Acts: They may as well prove *Juſtinian*'s Edict corrupted, and Pope *Gregory*'s Epiſtles, where it is ſaid, he durſt not confeſs it; yea, that he denied it to be his (*o*): And the *5th* Council prove he did deny it, by the interlocution of ſix Metropolitans at *Chalcedon* (*p*). And though *Baronius* do ſay poſitively in one place, *that the true Acts of* Chalcedon *have it, that* Ibas *confeſſed it to be his Epiſtle* (*q*); yet he cites thoſe very Acts, and the ſecond of *Nice* elſewhere, ſaying, *it was found not to be the Epiſtle of* Ibas, *and ſo it was condemned and he abſolved* (*r*). And the truth of the matter is, that *Ibas* denied at *Chalcedon* that ever he called *Cyril* an Heretick after the Union: But we

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 432. n. 211.

(*n*) *Bin.* notis in 5. Concil. pag. 172. *Lab.* 732.

(*o*) Edictum *Juſtin. Bin.* pag. 161. *Lab.* 707. *Greg. M.* Epiſt. 53. lib. 7.

(*p*) Concil. 5. Collat. 6. *Bin.* pag. 91. *Lab.* 516.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 69. n. 77.

(*r*) Id. *An.* 432. (pag. 626. n. 71.

have proved before, that he writ this Epistle divers years before that Union, and therein called *Cyril* Heretick (*s*); which is a denying the words of his own Epistle, for which he is censured in the *5th* Council.

(*s*) See Chap. 10.

Chap. xxvii. He alledges that these Acts say, *the Council of* Chalcedon *condemned the Epistle of* Ibas: Which he saith is untrue, and that he hath demonstrated the contrary out of the Acts of *Chalcedon* (*t*); and *Binius* calls this another Lye (*u*), both of them giving this as an instance that the Acts are corrupted: But if so, the whole Council is corrupted; for they say over and over, that this Epistle of *Ibas* was condemned by the definitions at *Chalcedon*, and that they had demonstrated this (*w*); and it was indeed their main business, to shew it was contrary to that Council, who forced him to condemn his own Epistle before they would receive him (*x*): And if *Binius* and *Baronius* say this be false, they give a General Council the Lye; and Pope *Gregory* also who saith, *without doubt this Epistle is contrary to the definition at* Chalcedon, *which was exactly followed by the 5th Council* (*y*). And since the Council of *Chalcedon* forbids all Writings for *Nestorius*, (such as this Epistle is,) and approve the Judgment of *Photius* and *Eustathius*, (who condemned this Epistle as Heretical,) and would not receive *Ibas*, till he Anathematized *Nestorius* and his Doctrines (*z*); 'Tis certain that Council as well as the fifth, did condemn *Ibas* his Epistle.

(*t*) *Baron.* ut supra. (lit. (*m*)
(*u*) *Bin.* in notis ut supr. (lit. *n.*)
(*w*) Concil. 5. Col. 8. *Bin.* 114. *Lab.* 567.
(*x*) Ibid. Col. 6. *Bin.* 91. *Lab.* 517.
(*y*) *Greg. M.* lib. 7. in d. 2. Ep. 54.
(*z*) Concil. Chalced. Act. 5. & Act. 10.

Chap. xxviii. Again, *Baronius* and *Binius* accuse the Council of divers defects, first, in omitting the Condemnation of *Origen*, and giving only a brief touch upon it (*a*). But this is a notorious Calumny; for the *5th* Council not only mention it transiently, in saying, *they and* Vigilius *had condemned* Origen *now* (*b*), but expresly Anathematize *Origen* and his impious Writings (*c*): And the Cardinal mistakes in saying, they first handled the cause of *Origen*, and then that of the three

(*a*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 440. n. 243. & pag. 439. n. 238. *Bin.* notis in Conc. 5. pag. 172. *Lab.* 732.
(*b*) Concil. 5. Collat. 5. *Bin.* 79. *Lab.* 490.
(*c*) Ib. Collat. 8 *Bin.* pag. 116. *Lab.* 575.

three Chapters (*d*): For *Nicephorus* ſaith, they read the Libels againſt the impious Opinions of *Origen*, the ſecond Seſſion (*e*): But indeed this Council did not afreſh condemn *Origen*, but only mention his being condemned in that Age, by moſt of the Biſhops preſent in this Council, about 15 year before (in *Menna's* Synod) upon an Edict of *Juſtinian*, to which the Weſtern Biſhops had ſubſcribed (*f*), which both *Evagrius*, *Nicephorus* and others miſtake for this *5th* Council: So that the Cardinal and *Binius* are both out, in charging the omiſſion of *Juſtinian's* Edict, as a defect in theſe Acts (*g*). For that Edict was not ſent to this *5th* Council, but to *Menna's* Synod; and that Epiſtle which *Binius* hath added to theſe Acts as *Juſtinian's*, is a late extract out of *Juſtinian's* large Decree: Yea, *Didymus* and *Evagrius*, who they ſay were condemned in this *5th* Council, were not condemned there except in general words (*h*), as holding with *Origen* in the point of præexiſtence (*i*). So that it is falſe and malicious in *Baronius* and *Binius* to charge *Theodorus* of *Cæſarea* (*k*), with ſtealing theſe things out of the Acts of this Council, which were never in them; upon an unjuſt ſurmiſe and ſlander of his being infected with *Origens* Hereſie.

(*d*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 440.
(*e*) *Niceph.* l. 17. c. 27. Et *Evagr.* lib. 4. c. 37.
(*f*) *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 280. n. 29, &c.
(*g*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 440. & *Bin.* ut ſupr (a)
(*h*) Concil. 5. Collat. 8. *Bin.* 116. *Lab.* 175. Anath. 11.
(*i*) Concil. Nicen. 2. Act. 1.
(*k*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 440. n. 244.

Chap. xxix. Like to this, is their pretence that theſe Acts want the Emperors Epiſtle (*l*), which he and *Binius* add out of *Cedrenus*, and thence inſinuate the Acts are defective: But *Juſtinian's* only true Epiſtle ſent to the Council is extant in the Acts (*m*), of which this is an Epitome by an ignorant hand, which ſaith *Eutyches* approved the Opinions of *Neſtorius*; and that *Neſtorius* was the Maſter of *Theodorus*, whereas *Juſtinian's* true Letter and the Council teach that he was his Scholar: And are not the Cardinal and *Binius* rare menders of Councils, who would ſupply their pretended defects with ſuch Stuff as this?

Bin. notis in Concil. 5. pag. 172. *Lab.* 732.
(*l*) *Baron.* ibid. *Bin.* & *Lab.* ib.
(*m*) Concil. 5. Coll. 1.

Chap. xxx.

Chap. xxx. *Baronius* also objects, that *the Constitution of* Vigilius *which evidently belongs to this Synod, is known to be taken away out of the Acts* (*m*). It is granted, it bears date the 14 of *May*, upon which the fifth Collation of this Council was had, but was sent to the Emperor first, and by him considered, and then offered to the Counsil the sixth Collation, *May* 19*th* as *Binius* owns (*n*). But indeed the Council never read this publickly, nor named it or *Vigilius*; to prevent offences, they confuted it indeed, and published his Letters to *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus*, which contradict the Constitution (*o*); but for his Credit (as *Baronius* owns,) thought fit to say nothing of his Constitution (*p*): And therefore, if this Constitution were stollen out of the Acts, it was by the Roman Church, to cover their Fathers nakedness, and conceal his Heresie.

(*m*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 403. n. 47, &c.

(*n*) *Bin.* notis in Concil. 5. pag. 176. *Lab.* 738.

(*o*) Concil. 5. Collat. 7.

(*p*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 434. n. 218.

Chap. xxxi. Lastly, He and *Binius* say, the Acts want the assignation of a Patriarchal Seat to *Jerusalem*, and taking two Provinces out of *Antioch*, and two out of *Alexandria* to put under it, which being by *Leo* opposed at *Chalcedon*, was now passed contrary to the old Order established at *Nice* (*q*): Which is not true, for it had the Title of a Patriarchate long before this Council (*r*), and the jurisdiction over the three *Palestinas* was assigned it at *Chalcedon* (*t*); which *Binius* in his Notes on that Council, and *Baronius* also expressly affirm (*u*): Yet here in their Account of the 5*th* Council, the Cardinal most falsly says, *Juvenalis* got this Decree to pass in the absence of the Pope's Legates, (*Baron. an* 553. *pag.* 441.) But if we consult the Council, The Popes Legates first spoke in this Cause, and expressly gave their consent to it (*w*): And though perhaps Pope *Leo* afterwards might oppose this, (as *Baronius* saith) that only shews how little a Popes Authority was valued; since in the Council of *Mennas*, *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem* held a Synod, and presided over all the Bishops of the three *Palestinas* (*x*). And

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 553. pag. 440, 441. n. 245. è *Gul. Tyr.* de *Bel* sacr. l. 24. c. 12.

(*r*) *Bellarm.* de Pont. l. 1. c. 24.

(*t*) Concil. Chal. Act. 7. vel 8.

(*u*) Concil. Chalced. ap. *Baron. An.* 451. Sess. 8. pag. 154. n. 124.

(*w*) Concil. Chal. Act. 7. *Bin.* pag. 271.

(*x*) Concil. sub. *Men.* Act. 5. *Bin.* pag. 734. *Lab.* pag. 187.

Baronius

Baronius recites the Title of another Council at *Jeruſalem*, where *Peter* the Patriarch preſided over all the Biſhops of the three *Paleſtinas*, 17 years before this fifth Council (*y*); which ſhews, that *Jeruſalem* had the Title and Juriſdiction of a Patriarch by virtue of the Canon at *Chalcedon*, and that *Baronius* and *Binius* are ridiculous and impudent to urge the want of a Fiction of *Gul. Tyrius* (refuted by *Berterius* (*z*)) as a defect in the Acts of this General Council.

(*y*) *Baron.* An. 536. pag. 265. & ap. *Bin.* p. 766 *Lab* p. 275.

(*z*) *Berterii* diatr. 2. cap. 2.

Chap. xxxii. The Cardinal objects alſo ſpurious and falſe Additions made to theſe Acts (*a*): And he inſtances in the *Monothelites*, who in the ſixth Synod are proved to have added 24 Leaves to theſe Acts (*b*), as alſo two Epiſtles of *Vigilius* to *Juſtinian* and *Theodora* (c). But though this be true (*d*), yet thoſe corrupt Additions were detected and razed out in the ſixth Council, and our Acts of the fifth Council have not one of thoſe Heretical Additions, but follow thoſe true Copies which were extant in *Gregory*'s time, and thoſe by which (70 years after his death) the falſe Copies were detected in the ſixth Council, ſo that this is meer Sophiſtry (*e*). As is alſo his Pretence, That the Laws of *Theodoſius*, recited in the fifth Collation againſt *Neſtorius*, are different from thoſe in the Code and in the *Epheſine* Council (*f*). For there is but one Law againſt *Neſtorius* in the Code (*g*), different from theſe, which mention his former Condemning the Neſtorians; but theſe Laws were againſt *Diodorus* and *Theodorus*, as well as the Neſtorians, at the Armenian Monks Petition (*h*). And note, That all *Theodoſius* his Laws againſt Hereticks, are not in his Code; for that Law in the Epheſine Council againſt the Neſtorians, was a true Law of this Emperours (*i*): And another in the Council of *Chalcedon* (k), which *Baronius* owns for true Laws of *Theodoſius*; yet neither of them are in the Code; ſo that he may as well ſay thoſe Acts are corrupted as theſe, becauſe thoſe Laws are not there.

(a) *Baron. An.* 553. p. 399. n. 29. & p. 439. n. 238.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 441. n. 247.

(c) *Baron.* ib.

(*d*) Vid. Concil. 6. Act. 3. & 14.

(e) *Baron. An.* 554. p. 445. n. 8.

(f) *Baron. An.* 553. p. 403. n. 46.

(*g*) Cod *Theodoſ.* Tit. de hæret. l. 66.

(*h*) Concil. 5. coll. 5.

(i) *Baron. An.* 448, pag. 50. n. 2.

(*k*) Id. An. 449. p. 103. n. 130.

Chap.

Chap. xxxiii. Again, *Baronius* ſaith, That Epiſtle of *Theodoret*'s to *Neſtorius* intimating his agreeing with that Heretick and rejecting *Cyril* after the Union, is a ſpurious addition to theſe Acts (*l*); which he proves by *Leontius* (m), who affirms ſome ſuch Letters to be fictitious. But will the Cardinal allow him to be good Evidence, where he makes but 22 Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament (*n*)? And doth he not commend *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* and *Diodorus*, and deny that ever *Theodoret* agreed with *Neſtorius* (o)? But even *Baronius* owns him to have been a Neſtorian (*p*); ſo that in this caſe *Leontius* is of no Credit. But that which is yet more ſtrange, That the Cardinal (in contradiction to himſelf) repeats and owns this very Epiſtle read in the fifth Council, to have been writ by *Theodoret* after the Union to *Neſtorius*, and that he favoured him ſtill (*q*); yet he brags, there is no mention of *Theodoret*'s being addicted to *Neſtorius* after the Peace made, and that his Epiſtles to *Dioſcorus* and *Leo* ſufficiently wipe off that Aſperſion (*r*). But thoſe Epiſtles are ſuſpicious, as firſt appearing out of a Vatican Copy. And whereas the Union with *Cyril* was made *An.* 432. (*s*), theſe Epiſtles were writ long after that to *Dioſcorus*, *An.* 444, and that to *Leo*, *An.* 449. So that if theſe Epiſtles were genuine, they do not prove he was Orthodox till ten or twelve year after the Union. But two things prove them ſpurious: Firſt, *Theodoret* boaſts in them both, that he had been 26 years a Biſhop, and a Preacher at *Antioch*, yet none ever reproved his Doctrin; yea, that his Senſe and the Churches always agreed, having never been accuſed by any, nor accuſed any (*t*). Which is an horrid falſhood; for had he not been reproved by *Cyril*, depoſed by a General Council, and ſubſcribed the Condemnation of *Cyril*? Secondly, In both theſe Epiſtles he ſaith, he had been 26 years a Biſhop, yet one was writ 5 years after the other, and by *Baronius* his Computation he was but 21 years a Biſhop when he writ to *Dioſcorus*, being made Biſhop

Anno

(l) *Baron. An.* 436. Tom. 5. pag. 658. n. 10.

(m) Qui vixit *An.* 580. Lib. de ſectis.

(n) *Leont.* cap. 2.

(o) Ibid. cap. 4.

(p) *Baron.* An. 431. pag. 602, & 598.

(q) *Baron. An.* 432. pag. 628. n. 80.

(r) Id. *An.* 436. pag. 658. n. 11, 12. Et *An.* 449. pag. 106. n. 140.

(s) *Baron. An.* 432. p. 626. n. 72.

(t) Epiſtol. ad *Dioſc. Baron.* An. 444. & ad *Leon.* An. 449. & ad *Nomum.* An. 448.

Anno 423. (*u*). And his Hiſtory (which mentions the Tranſlation of the Body of S.*Chryſoſtom* (*w*), and ſo muſt be writ ſeven years after the Union) commends *Theodorus* of *Mopſveſtia* for Orthodox (*x*), ſhews he was a Neſtorian then. *Baronius* would wipe off this by pretending he writ his Hiſtory before the Quarrel about *Neſtorius* (*y*); but in the ſame place ſaith, He follows *Sozomen* (whoſe Book came out *An.*439.) in commending *Theodorus*. So that after all his ſhifts, *Theodoret* was a Favourer of *Neſtorius*, *An.* 436. when he writ that Epiſtle read in this fifth Council, and long after.

(*u*) *Baron. An.* 423 pag. 481. n. 10.
(*w*) Id An. 438. pag. 663. n. 6. *Theodoret.* hiſt. lib. 5. cap. 36.
(*x*) *Theodoret.* ibid. cap. 40.
(*y*) *Baron. An.* 427. pag. 506, & 507. n. 28.

Chap. xxxiv. *Baronius* and *Binius* ſay, The Acts are corrupted, becauſe they affirm an Epiſtle to *John* of *Antioch*, (wherein the Author rejoyces for *Cyril*'s death) was writ by *Theodoret*, which they affirm was writ by an Impoſtor (*z*); becauſe *John* was dead ſeven years before *Cyril*. I Reply, That is a Miſtake, for *John* was made Biſhop *An.* 427. and according to *Nicephorus* ſat 18 years, which reaches to the year 444. in which *Baronius* ſaith *Cyril* died. But ſuppoſe *John* were dead when *Theodoret* writ this, *Baronius* of all men ſhould not make this a mark of Forgery, who allows *Clement*'s Epiſtle writ to *James* Biſhop of *Hieruſalem*, who had been dead 30 year, for genuine; and ſo doth *Binius* (a): And the Cardinal cites and commends an Epiſtle of *Theodoſius* as authentick, writ to S.*Chryſoſtom* 30 years after he was dead (*b*). And, Secondly, the Epiſtle is *Theodoret*'s; but the Inſcription only (which ſhould be to *Domnus*) is miſtaken; for it is as plain by his Sermon before *Domnus* after *Cyril*'s death, which we have alſo in the fifth Council (*c*), as by this Epiſtle, that *Theodoret* was an Enemy to *Cyril* after his death; and *Baronius* may well pardon the Error in the inſcription of *John*'s Name for *Domnus*; for he allows innumerable Epiſtles, Edicts, &c. to be genuine notwithſtanding Errors in the Title (*d*), and therefore for ſo ſmall a miſtake in the Title of an Epiſtle ſhould not ask, *What credit is to be given to ſuch Acts* (e)? His own Annals have many greater Miſtakes, as the Author proves

(*z*) *Bin.* not. in Concil. 5 p. 172. *Lab.* 732. *Baron. An.* 444. p. 20, &c. & *An.* 553. p. 402.
(*a*) Confer. *Baron.* An. 63 & 93. & *Bin.* not. in Ep. *Clem.* & *Turrian.* maximè.
(*b*) *Baron. An.* 438. pag. 663. n. 8.
(*c*) Concil. V. Collat. 5. *Bin.* pag. 86. *Lab.* col. 508.
(*d*) See many Inſtances in the Author at large, p. 429, &c
(*e*) *Baron. An.* 553. p. 403. n. 46.

proves (*f*); yet he would have us credit them. Yea, in this reckoning of *John* of *Antioch*'s dying ſeven years before *Cyril*, he miſtakes the whole time almoſt, according to *Nicephorus*, and four years by his own reckoning of *John*'s entring, *An.* 427. dying 436, yet ſitting 13 years; for ſo *John* did not dye till 440, that is, four year before S. *Cyril*: And the Epiſtles of *Theodoret* to *Dioſcorus* and *Leo*, on which he depends for his Arithmetick, are one or both of them forged. We conclude therefore, that the Epiſtle mentioned in the fifth Council was *Theodoret*'s, who was a Neſtorian after S. *Cyril*'s death, and he writ it to *Domnus* (not to *John*) Biſhop of *Antioch*.

(f) *Vigil.* dorm. c. 34. p. 435.

Chap. xxxv. But he who accuſeth the fifth Council for Forgeries, doth follow many forged Writings himſelf in his diſcourſe about it. Firſt, The Confeſſion of Faith made by *Mennas*, *Theodorus* of *Cæſarea* and others, by way of ſubmiſſion, recorded in the very Conſtitution of *Vigilius*, is Forged (*g*). For as to the Matter of it: How is it likely the Eaſtern Biſhops ſhould ſay, They allowed all the Acts of the former four Councils, made by conſent of the Pope's Legates? Or ask him pardon for Injuries which they ſay they had never done to him? Or how agrees this with *Baronius* his ſaying, *Theodorus* asked pardon for his *Scoffs and Contumelies againſt* Vigilius (*h*)? or with *Vigilius* his form of Excommunication of *Theodorus*, for deſpiſing his Authority (*i*)? As to the time, this Confeſſion and Submiſſion is ſaid to be made after the Decree for Taciturnity, (which was never made) *viz. An.* 552. (*k*). And we have proved *Mennas* was dead five year before, and that *Theodorus* did always ſtand firm againſt the three Chapters (*l*). Secondly, He cites one *Euſtathius* out of *Surius*, who is proved Fabulous before (*m*). Thirdly, The Epiſtles of *Theodoret*, which were ſhewed before to be forged (*n*). And we add, That for all his brags to *Dioſcorus*, *An.* 444. he writes a kind Letter to *Irenæus* a Neſtorian, depoſed Biſhop of *Tyre* (o): And another to *Nomus*, wherein he rails at the pious Emperour *Theo-*

(g) *Baron. An.* 553. p. 404. n. 50. *Bin.* Tom II. par. 2. pag. 13. *Lab.* col. 338.

(h) *Baron. An.* 552. pag. 389. n. 20.

(i) *Vigil.* Epiſt. poſt. Ep. 16. *Bin.* pag. 12. *Lab.* pag. 334.

(k) See above (*h*)

(l) See Ch. 23.

(m) See Ch. 20.

(n) See Ch. 33.

(o) *Baron. An.* 448. pag. 51. n. 7, 8.

Theodoſius, by whom he and other Neſtorians were depoſed, and his Writings forbidden (*p*), while as he falſly aſſerts Arians and all other Hereticks were tolerated. *Theodoret* therefore was a Neſtorian 16 year after the Union with *Cyril*, and theſe Epiſtles are Forged, which ſay the contrary. Fourthly, He cites the Action at *Chalcedon* concerning *Domnus*, which is a Vatican Forgery (*q*): For it is not in the Greek, nor in *Liberatus*, *Evagrius* nor *Nicephorus*; and that *Domnus* (for whom ſubſiſtence is provided in this Forged Action) was dead before the Council of *Chalcedon*, as both *Juſtinian* and the fifth Council witneſs (*r*), who (for all *Baronius* frivolous Objections to ſupport this Forgery) muſt needs have truer Copies of the Council of *Chalcedon*, than his Vatican now affords. And indeed *Domnus* was depoſed in the Epheſine Pſeudo-Synod, all whoſe Acts were declared void at *Chalcedon*, except that which depoſed *Domnus* (then deceaſed) and put in *Maximus* at *Antioch* (s). Fifthly, *Baronius* cites *Anaſtaſius*'s Lives of the Popes, who is always full of Fables, eſpecially in *Vigilius* his Life, in which are more Lies than Lines (*t*): For he makes his Entrance to be when *Belliſarius* warred againſt *Vitiges*, who, he ſaith, was taken by *John* the Bloody, and brought to *Rome* by *Belliſarius* and *Vigilius*, who gave *Belliſarius* the Sacrament to bring *Vitiges* ſafe to *Juſtinian* (u). But *John* and *Narſes* were both abſent at the taking of *Ravenna*, where *Vitiges* freely ſubmitted to *Belliſarius*, who kept him there till he carried him by Sea to *Conſtantinople* (w). So that *Vitiges* came not to *Rome* at all. Secondly, *Anaſtaſius* ſays, *The Emperour then enquired of* Belliſarius, *how he had placed* Vigilius *in* Silverius *room, and thanked him for it* (x). But *Silverius* was depoſed, and *Vigilius* put in three years before (*y*); yea, *Juſtinian* had writ to *Vigilius*, and knew that *Silverius* was dead a year before; and *Vigilius* had writ to the Emperour (z), the year before *Belliſarius* came with *Vitiges* to *Conſtantinople* (a); and *Binius* ſaith, *Juſtinian* did not thank *Belliſarius* (b). Thirdly, *Anaſtaſius* talks of *Belliſarius* being ſent into *Africk*, and of his killing *Gontharis*, and offering great

(*p*) Id. ibid. pag. 52. n. 11. Edict. vide Leg. 66. Cod. *Theod.*

(q) *Baron.* An. 451. pag. 155. n. 129.

(*r*) Vid. *Juſtin.* Edict. *Bin.* pag. 165. & *Lab.* col. 718. Vid. item Concil. 5. collat. 6. *Bin.* 103. *Lab.* 546.

(*t*) Concil. *Chalced.* Act. 10. *Bin.* p 295. (*t*) *Bin.* Tom. II. par. 2. pag. 1. *Lab.* Tom. V. p. 306.

(u) Vita *Vigil.* ibid.

(*w*) *Procop.* de bell. Goth. l. 2 & 3.

(x) Vita *Vigil.* ut ſupr.

(*y*) *Procop.* de bell. Goth. l. 1.

(z) *Baron. An.* 540. p. 303. n. 11. & 305. n. 20.

(a) *Baron. An.* 541. p. 312. n. 3.

(b) *Bin.* not. in vit. *Vigilii.*

Spoils in his return at *Rome*, to *Vigilius*, *&c.* (c): But after this *Belliſarius* was not ſent into *Africk*, but into *Perſia* (d), where he ſtayed three years, and it was *Ariobindus* and *Artabanus* who were ſent into *Africk*, the latter of which treacherouſly killed *Gontharis* (e). So that *Belliſarius* offered no *Vandal* Spoils at all; or if (as *Binius* would have it *(f)*) he did, when he wan *Rome* from *Vitiges*, that was in *Silverius* his time; ſo that is falſe alſo. Fourthly, *Anaſtaſius* makes *Theodora* write at this time to *Vigilius*, *To come to* Conſtantinople *and reſtore* Anthimus, *which he refuſed* (g). *Binius* after *Baronius* makes this a Miraculous change (*h*), and ſays it was juſt upon *Silverius* his death, at his firſt ſtep into the See: But if it was after *Gontharis* was ſlain, it was not till the 19*th* of *Juſtinian* (i), five years or ſix years after *Vigilius* was made Pope: And the Change is as falſe as The time; for *Liberatus* ſaith, Vigilius *did perform his Promiſe to the Empreſs, and writ as ſhe deſired* (k); but afterwards it ſeems, he finding the Emperour reſolute, did confirm the Depoſition of *Anthimus* (l). So that *Anaſtaſius* his Story of *Theodora*'s writing to *Vigilius* after *Gontharis* was ſlain, is a Fable: And *Victor* (who then lived) ſaith, *Vigilius* was called to *Conſtantinople* by the Emperour, (not about *Anthimus*, but) to condemn the three Chapters in his Nineteenth year (*m*). Fifthly, *Anaſtaſius* fables, That the Romans accuſed *Vigilius* of Murder, &c. and that *Anthimus Sorbo* was ſent by the Empreſs to ſeize him by force; which he did (the People abuſing and curſing him as he went out of *Rome*), and thus he was violently carried by *Sicily* to *Conſtantinople*; to which place coming on *Chriſtmas* Even, the Emperour met and kiſſed him with Tears, and the People ſang, *The Lord cometh* (n). But *Baronius* gives him the Lye (*o*), as doth alſo *Binius* (p). For *Vigilius* voluntarily went from *Rome* in the 11*th* year of the *Gothic* War, *An.* 546. toward *Conſtantinople* (q), and ſtaying long in *Sicily*, arrived at the Court about *April* of the year following. Sixthly, *Anaſtaſius* tells a long Story after *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*, of the Conteſts between him and the Empe-

rour,

(c) Vita *Vigil.* ut ſupra.

(d) *Procop.* de bell. Perſic. l. 2.

(e) Idem bell Vandal. lib. 2, & 4.

(f) *Bin.* not. in Vit. *Vigilii.*

(g) Vita *Vigil.* ut ſupra.

(h) *Bin.* not. ibid. *Baron.* An. 540. p. 303.

(i) *Baron. An.* 545. pag. 334.

(k) *Liberat.* Breviar. c. 22. *Bin.* pag. 192. *Lab.* 775.

(l) *Vigil.* Epiſt. 4 & 5.

(m) *Victor.* Chron. an. 4. poſt. Conſul. Baſil. *Baron. An.* 545.

(n) *Anaſtaſ.* in vit. *Vigil.* ut ſupr.

(o) *Baron. An.* 546. p. 347. n. 54, 55.

(p) *Bin.* not. in vit. *Vigil.* p. 3. *Lab.* 310.

(q) *Procop.* de bell. Goth. l. 3.

rour, with his Empreſs, about reſtoring *Anthimus*; which the Pope refuſing, they tore him from the Altar of S. *Euphemia*, cruelly uſed him, impriſoned and baniſhed him (*a*). Which are all Fables; for *Anthimus* was depoſed Ten years before (*b*), and his Cauſe forgot, the three Chapters being now the only diſpute; yea, *Baronius* and *Binius* (c), who would have ſomething of this true, make the buffeting of *Vigilius* and his flight to *Euphemia*'s Church, to happen four years after *Theodorus*'s death; and indeed in Pope *Agapetus*'s time there was ſome ſuch Conteſt about *Anthimus*, which *Anaſtaſius* fabulouſly applies to *Vigilius*, and *Baronius* with *Binius* do cheriſh the Fiction. Seventhly, *Anaſtaſius* tells us, how the *Goths* after this made *Totilas* King, who beſieged and took *Rome*; but ſpared the People, and lived like a Father among them (*d*). But *Totilas* was made King four or five year before *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople* (e), and took *Rome* while he was in *Sicily* (f), and was ſo cruel as to kill all the Citizens they met, and intended to ruin both City and People, had not *Pelagius* and *Belliſarius* ſtayed his Rage from places and perſons; however, he made a woful deſolation there (*g*). Eighthly, *Anaſtaſius* ſaith, *Narſes* was ſent at the ſame time into *Italy*, and *Totilas* with many *Goths* were ſlain, by the help (ſaith *Baronius*) of the Bleſſed Virgin (*h*). But firſt, he miſtakes the time; for *Narſes* overcame not *Totilas* till ſix year after his firſt ſacking *Rome*, in the 18*th* year of the *Gothick* War (*i*); and *Binius*, with *Baronius*, fooliſhly aſcribe it to the Year wherein *Juſtinian* revoked his Edict, (which he never revoked at all) and this *Binius* ſaith was the 10*th* year of *Totilas* (as *Benedict* had predicted (*k*)). But *Baronius* proves *Benedict* a falſe Prophet; for he (truly) places *Totilas* his death in the 11*th* year (*l*). As to the help of the Bleſſed Virgin, mentioned both by *Baronius* and *Binius* (m), *Procopius* ſaith, *Narſes* did aſcribe the Victory wholly to God (*n*); and *Evagrius* doth not mention his praying to, or relying on the Virgin; but ſpeaks of a Report by ſome, of the Bleſſed

(a) *Anaſtaſ.* vit. *Vigil.* ut ſupra.
(b) *Baron. An.* 536. pag. 244.
(c) *Baron. An.* 552. pag. 387. n. 8. *Bin.* not. in vit *Vigil.* ut ſupr.
(d) *Anaſtaſ.* in vit. *Vigil.* ut ſupr.
(e) *Baron. An.* 542. p. 322. n. 1.
(f) *Baron. An.* 547. pag. 353. n. 12.
(g) *Procop.* de bell. Goth. l. 3. pag. 372, &c.
(h) *Anaſtaſ.* vit. *Vigil.* ut ſupr. *Baron. An.* 553. p. 396, & 397. n. 13 & 18.
(i) *Procop.* de bell. Goth. l. 3.
(k) *Bin.* not. in vit. *Vigil.* p. 3. *Lab.* 310.
(l) *Baron.* ut ſupr. lit. (*b*).
(m) Locis ſupr. cit.
(n) *Procop.* de bell. Goth. lib. 3.

Bleſſed Virgins appearing to him from God with notice when to fight (*o*), but doth not affirm it for truth; yet the Cardinal proves invocation of Sains by this Fable. Laſtly, after this victory (*Anaſtaſius* tells us) the Roman Clergy in a body deſired *Narſes*, if *Vigilius* and the Clergy baniſhed with him were yet alive, they might be recalled (*p*); whereas *Vigilius* was then at *Conſtantinople* and never baniſhed at all; yea, the *5th* Council was aſſembled that year in which *Totilas* was ſlain; yet hence *Baronius* (on the credit of this Fabulous Author) invents a ſtory of *Vigilius* Baniſhment after the *5th* Council.

(*o*) *Evagr.* l. 4. cap. 23.

(*p*) *Anaſtaſ.* in vita *Vigilij*, ut ſupr.

Chap. xxxvi. Finally, *Baronius* overlooking the Ambition, Treachery and Hereſie of *Vigilius*, can find but one ill thing in his life, which is his going to *Conſtantinople* when the Emperor required him; this he ſaith, was always fatal to the Catholick Church for the Pope to leave *Rome* (*q*). Was it ſo when the Popes removed for 70 years to *Avignion* (*r*)? Was it ſo when *Agapetus* 10 years before came to *Conſtantinople*? No, ſaith *Baronius*, that was lucky, God ſent him, and the power of the Apoſtolick ſeat was thereby demonſtrated (*s*): So that the difference was in the Men, *Agapetus* was a ſteddy Catholic, *Vigilius* an Heretical Hypocrite: Whoſe life ſhall conclude this Treatiſe.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 346. pag. 347. n. 55.

(*r*) *Genebr.* Chron. *An.* 1305.

(*s*) *Baron. An.* 536. pag. 241. n. 12, &c.

His Ambition early appeared in procuring *Boniface* the 2*d.* contrary to the Canons to chooſe him for his Succeſſor in a Synod (*t*): But the Senate and the Laws of the Empire forced *Boniface* by a ſecond Synod, to vacate this Election of *Vigilius* (*u*). Again, upon *Agapetus* death, he made a compact with *Theodora* the Empreſs, that for 350 *l.* in Gold, and the Papacy (which ſhe was to give,) he would reſtore *Anthimus*, and diſannul the Council of *Chalcedon* (*w*); but coming to *Rome* he found *Silverius* in the Chair, upon which he tampers with *Belliſarius*, and ſhewing him the Empreſs's Mandate, promiſes him 100 *l.* in Gold to make him Pope (*x*). Whereupon *Silverius* was falſly accuſed of a Plot,

(*t*) *Anaſtaſ.* in vit. *Bonif.* 2. *Bin.* pag. 643. *An.* 532.

(*u*) *Silverij* Ep. 1. & *Anaſt.* ut ſupr.

(*w*) *Liberat.* in Brev. cap. 22. *Bin.* pag. 192. *Lab.* 775.

(*x*) Idem. ibid.

a Plot to betray *Rome* to the Goths, depoſed and baniſhed, and *Vigilius* thruſt into the Seat (*y*), Uſurping it two years during *Silverius* life, and acting all that time as lawful Pope, *viz.* from *An.* 538. to *An.* 540. (*z*), writing to, and receiving Epiſtles from *Juſtinian*, *Cæſarius*, *Etherius*, *&c.* (*a*) But perfidiouſly broke his promiſe both to *Theodora* and *Belliſarius*, and would neither reſtore *Anthimus*, for fear of the Romans, nor pay *Belliſarius* the Money (*b*): And cruelly uſes poor *Silverius* baniſhed to *Patara*, who in a Synod there excommunicated *Vigilius* (*c*). But the Emperor hearing of it, ſent him back to have the Cauſe heard more fully (*d*), and being come into *Italy*, *Vigilius* by new promiſes, gets *Belliſarius* to put him into his Hands, and ſent him to the Iſland *Palmaria*, and ſtarved him to death there (*e*). Upon this *Baronius* and *Binius* pretend a fit of Conſcience took him, and he abdicated the Papacy, deſiring to come in by a new Election, (of which he was ſure by *Belliſarius* power (*f*)). And ſo the Hypocrit gets in a ſecond time, the Electors being inſpired, ſaith *Baronius* (*g*); yet he hath till this moment deſcribed him as an Ambitious Deacon, mad with Pride, a Patron of Hereticks, a Schiſmatick, a Simoniack, an Uſurper, a Succeſſor of *Simon Magus*, and an Antichriſt (*b*).

(*y*) Idem. ibid. & vid. *Anaſtaſ.* in vitâ *Silverij*
(*z*) *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 274. & *An.* 540. pag. 300.
(*a*) Vide Epiſt. *Vigil.*
(*b*) *Liberat.* apud *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 276.
(*c*) Epiſt. 1. *Silver.* ad *Vigil.*
(*d*) *Liberat.* ut ſupr.
(*e*) Id. ibid. *Baron. An.* 540. pag. 300. n. 1. & *Anaſtaſ.* in vit. *Silverij.*
(*f*) *Baron. An.* 540. pag. 301. n. 4.
(*g*) Ib. pag. 302. n. 7.

Such was his entrance, and his Acts were ſuitable, for *Liberatus* ſaith, he did write an Epiſtle purſuant to his promiſe to *Theodora*, and *Victor* affirms, that he writ unto *Theodoſius* of *Alexandria*, to *Anthimus* of *Conſtantinople*, and to *Severus* of *Antioch*, (*Eutychians* depoſed) *as to Catholicks* (*i*), aſſuring them he believed as they did, *but bids them not tell any ſo*: But *Baronius* ſays, this Epiſtle is not his: *Bellarmin* ſays it may be his, but that it was only in ſhew, and before he was Pope (*k*). *Baronius* Quarrels at the Inſcription, as if he called *Juſtinian* and *Theodora his Lords and Chriſts*, but *Victor* expreſly ſaith it was writ (not to them, but) to three Heretical Patriarchs, and that the Inſcription was, *To my Lords and Bretheren joyned to us in the Love of Chriſt our*

(*b*) Vid. loca citat. ap. Authorem.
(*i*) *Liberat.* cap. 22. *Victor* in Chronico ubi ipſa Epiſtola extat. & ap. *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 276. n. 14.
(*k*) *Bel.* l. 4. de Pontif. cap. 10.

our Saviour (*l*); and for all *Binius* and his pretences, it is not unuſual for the Pope to call Eminent Biſhops, *Lords*; Pope *Urban* calls *Anſelm Father and Maſter* (*m*), and *Damaſus* calls *Proſper* and other Numidian Biſhops his Lords (*n*). Secondly, He alledges that *Liberatus* falſly affirms, that *Vigilius* in the Subſcription of this Epiſtle condemned *Dioſcorus* who was an Eutychian, which is abſurd in a Letter whereby he would prove himſelf of that Party: To which it is replied, *it is an Error of the Scribe, putting* Dioſcorus *name for* Neſtorius, *of which Party all the reſt were there named*; And the Annaliſt allows many ſuch literal miſtakes in *Liberatus* (*o*). Thirdly, *Baronius* asks, if this were his Epiſtle, why he was not upbraided with it by *Theodora* and others, when he refuſed to reſtore *Anthimus*? 'Tis anſwered, for ought he knows this was objected to *Vigilius*, ſince none can argue, *ab Autoritate humanâ negativè*: However, it would have been objected had there been occaſion; but the Story of the reſtoring *Anthimus* is a Fiction of *Anaſtaſius*, as he applies it to be the ground of a Quarrel, after *Vigilius* came to *Conſtantinople*: As to *Bellarmine*'s Note, that owns the Epiſtle, but ſays, it was writ in *Silverius* his time before he was true Pope (*p*); which excuſe alſo *Baronius*, *Binius* and *Gretzer* make (*q*): We muſt Note that *Liberatus*, an Author of that time, relates it to be writ after *Silverius* death: And when *Silverius* was returned back to *Italy*, *Belliſarius* again preſſed *Vigilius* to perform his promiſe to the Empreſs, which doth evidently ſuppoſe he had not as yet performed it, *An.* 540. And ſince *Silverius* died in *June* that year, (ſoon after he fell into *Vigilius* hands,) we may juſtly think he was too buſie in diſpatching him and contriving his new Election, to write this till after he was real and ſole Pope; ſo that (*r*) *Nauclerus* puts after *Silverius* death, *Theodora*'s demanding of him to fulfil his promiſe: But they object, that at this time he condemned *Anthimus* and confirmed the Council of *Chalcedon*, in his Epiſtles to *Juſtinian* and *Mennas* (*s*), and

(*l*) *Vict.* Chron. *An.* 2. poſt Conſul. *Vigil.*

(*m*) *Malmſb.* l. 1. geſt. Pontif. pag. 127.

(*n*) *Damaſ.* Ep. 5. ap. *Bin.* Tom. 1. pag. 508.

(*o*) *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 275. n. 7.

(*p*) *Bellarm.* de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 10.

(*q*) *Baron. An.* 538. pag. 277. n. 15. *Bin.* not. in *Liberat.* pag. 194. *Gretzer.* defenſ. *Bel.* l. 4.

(*r*) *Naucler.* Chron. gen. 18.

(*s*) Ep. *Baron. An.* 540. pag. 303.

ſo

ſo it is not likely he ſhould write the contrary to theſe Biſhops juſt then. 'Tis anſwered, he was a Notorious Hypocrite (as they own,) and ſo might write on Opinion openly to delude the Emperor, and another ſecretly to the Hereticks; and (for all *Bellarmine's* pretences) this laſt was his heart and mind; for why ſhould he diſſemble in ſecret with his Friends, with whom, as he tells them, *he had but one Soul*? He might very likely diſſemble with the Emperor, for fear of being expelled out of the Seat he ſo much coveted; But what hurt or good could depoſed Biſhops do him? Fear therefore, not an Orthodox mind, reſtrained him from openly condemning the true Faith, and his Ambition to keep his high Station made him do it privately only: Which ſhews the weakneſs of *Bellarmine's* excuſe, as if he did not write this *ex animo*: And equally frivolous, is that pretence of his not writing it *as Pope*, for when he writes of a matter of Faith and defines and declares it, he either writes as Pope then or never, for that is his proper office: And the Neſtorians might make all theſe objections againſt his Orthodox Epiſtle to the Emperor.

The ſecond Act of *Vigilius* was his Conſtitution for Neſtorianiſm, by which he run into the contrary Hereſie to that wherein he was dipt before, which hath been ſufficiently manifeſted in this Treatiſe. There remains now only his Exit to be conſidered, of which *Liberatus* only ſaith, *How* Vigilius *being afflicted by Hereſie died is known to all* (*t*); *Bellarmine* expounds him, that it was that ſame Hereſie which he firſt ſecretly favoured, that afflicted him (*u*): *Baronius* obſerves, he was by Gods juſt Judgment miſerably toſſed all his Life, hated by the Emperor and Eaſtern Biſhops for defending the three Chapters, and execrable to the Weſtern for his inconſtancy; and when he was juſt coming into the Haven, died before he could reach home in *Sicily*, of the Torment of the Stone: As he had Murdered his Predeceſſor a little before in an Iſland, ſo he died in one: And here we leave him to ſtand or fall to

(*t*) *Liberat.* Brev. c. 22. ut ſupr.

(*u*) *Bellarm.* de Pont. Rom. l. 4. cap. 10.

his own Master, not imitating *Baronius* his spite to *Justinian* (*w*), in determining his final Estate.

(*w*) Baron. *An.* 565. pag. 497. n. 6.

An Appendix to this History.

IN *Labbe*'s Edition, there is subjoyned to this Council an Epistle of *Vigilius* to *Eutychius*, and a dicourse of *P. de Marca*'s upon it, wherein it is extolled as a genuine writing and a sufficient confirmation of this 5*th* Council (*a*): And though the foregoing History do abundantly confute this, yet we will not pass it without some observations concerning this pompous piece of Forgery.

(*a*) *Lab.* col. 596.

First, In the Epistle *Vigilius* is made to say, *that he is and was of the same Faith with* Eutychius, *and the rest of the Bishops at* Constantinople: But if so, why did he exclaim that the Catholick Faith was in danger to be rooted up (*b*)? Or how came he to Anathematize *Theodorus*? And why did he suffer so much for a matter that was not of Faith?

(*b*) Baron. *An.* 546. pag. n. 47.

Secondly, In this Epistle *Vigilius Anathematizeth all that at any time believed the three Chapters ought to be received or defended, and all that have endeavoured to hinder their being condemned* (*c*): Now is it probable he should curse all his Friends in *Africa* and in the Western Church, yea and himself so dreadfully, who had received and defended them, and done all in his power to hinder their condemnation?

(*c*) Epist. *Vigil.* ap. *Lab.* col. 600.

Thirdly, This illustrious Monument (as 'tis called) can be no confirmation of the 5*th* Council, because it never names or so much as hints at that Council. So that it can pass for no more than *Vigilius* his Recantation of his former Opinions, and being writ after the Council, seems to be designed for the Emperors private satisfaction

ſatisfaction: For the Eaſtern Church then did not believe a Popes confirmation neceſſary, to make a General Councils Decrees valid:

Fourthly, This Epiſtle is dated in *December*, and the Council aroſe but in *June* before, which argues the falſhood of it; for it is not likely that he ſhould ſo ſoon revoke his ſolemn conſtitution, and make ſo great a change, or if he did, it is ſtrange that living above two years after, he did not receive ſome mark of *Juſtinian*'s favour in all that time, no nor return to his See in Peace.

As to the Diſſertation of *de Marca*, we may note (*d*), that the years when, and the place where this writing was found, give juſt ſuſpicions of its being an Impoſture: It was (it ſeems) found by a Greek, *An.* 1276. in the *Vatican*, and he pretended to Tranſcribe it out of a Manuſcript there writ *An.* 753. Now the Original of theſe is dated two hundred years after the 5*th* Council, and all that time no body ever heard of *Vigilius* his Confirmation; and if this date be genuine, it might very probably be invented at that time, being the very time when the Eaſtern Church began (contrary to the ſentiments of *Rome*) to pull down their Images; and that was a fit ſeaſon to produce Evidence, that the Greeks ought to ſubmit to the Latins, whoſe Popes as they pretended had made all their General Councils Decrees Authentick. And the date of the later Tranſcript is more ſuſpicious ſtill, being the critical time when the poor Eaſtern Emperor *Nich. Palælogus* for getting Money and Aid from the Pope, was forced to ſend ſome corrupted Biſhops, to make a ſeeming Submiſſion to, and Union with the Roman Church, and to carry on this deſign *An.* 1276. no doubt, care was taken to find out or make this Epiſtle and ſend it into *Greece*: And the Vatican whence it was taken, is known to be the Mint and Ware-houſe of Forgeries: So that every circumſtance is ſuſpicious. And ſo is the Reaſon, which the learned Patron of it gives why it is ſo valuable, *viz. becauſe it vindicates*

(*d*) Diſſert. Num. i. *Lab.* pag. 601.

the credit of the Roman See, which was much leſſened by the belief, that the 5th *Council was owned for a lawful and general, though* Vigilius *oppoſed it.* Now at *Rome* where the Popes Authority is the main if not the ſole point of Religion, there have been innumerable Writings piouſly forged, to carry on this great end, and this ſeems to be of that ſort, only it appeared not early enough for *Baronius* to cite it; however as our Author notes, he gueſſed there was (or foreſaw there would be) ſuch a thing; For he poſitively avers, (as was ſhewed) upon meer conjecture, that *Vigilius* did confirm the *5th* Council: But he and his party lay it down for a Maxim, that nothing can be a General Council, but what is confirmed by the Pope: Therefore Evidence or not Evidence, *Binius* and *Baronius* affirm it was ſo; and they are as confident who never ſaw this Epiſtle, as *de Marca* is who publiſhed it; ſo that to through-paced Catholicks who take their words, this Epiſtle is a needleſs diſcovery.

Num. ii. *Lab.* col. 601.

But let us ſee, what Authority he hath to ſupport this famous Confirmation: He ſaith *Evagrius* witneſſeth, that Vigilius *conſented in writing, but would not come to the Council* (*e*): But this conſent was before the Synod met, and is therefore plainly ſet down in *Evagrius* before the convening, with which conſent in writing both *Juſtinian* and the Council do often upbraid this inconſtant Pope: Nor can *Evagrius* be expounded of any ſubſequent conſent, ſince he goes on after this paſſage to relate the acts of the Council: Nor do any of the later Greeks who follow him ſay any more, than to imply *Vigilius* his precedent conſent: And the *6th* Council relate the calling of the *5th* Council, after the agreement between *Juſtinian* and *Vigilius* (*f*); nor can their words without manifeſt violence be ſtretched to this Confirmation, which had it then been extant in the Greek Copy, and (as *de Marca* owns) wanting in the Latin (*g*), that Council had found out and obſerved this among other Variations.

(*e*) *Evagr.* Hiſt. lib. 4. c. 34.

(*f*) Concil. 6. Act. 18. Tom. iii. par. 1. pag. 194.

(*g*) Diſſertat. infr. n. 21. pag. 612.

The

The Teſtimony of *Pelagius* which our Author thinks ſo clear, is no Evidence unleſs it be againſt this Epiſtle; for he ſpeaks not of *Vigilius*, but of the Latin Church, which *came ſlowly to ſee their Error——laboured a great while——ſtrove a long time even to ſuffering——and would not of a ſudden loſe their labour, till the Truth did appear*——(*b*). This plainly refers to the Roman Clergy and Weſtern Biſhops, who after *Vigilius* death ſtood out in defence of the three Chapters ſo ſtifly, that *Pelagius* the 1*ſt*, *Vigilius* his Succeſſor, could ſcarce find any to conſecrate him (*i*). And at laſt he was forced to get *Narſes* to uſe violent Methods to bring them in to his Communion (*k*); now this was three year after the Council. But how could *Vigilius* his haſty turn in ſix Months time be called a ſlow change, or a long ſtriving? And if *Pelagius* the ſecond had known of *Vigilius* his confirming the 5*th* Council, he would not have uſed ſo many ſhifts to ward off the force of his and the Roman Churches diſſent, which was objected; this Epiſtle had ſtopt their Mouths for ever; and if St. *Gregory* had known of it, he had referred thoſe who doubted of the Apoſtolical conſent, not to *Pelagius* his Epiſtle, but to this Authentick Confirmation of *Vigilius* himſelf.

Num. iii. *Lab.* col. 603.

(*b*) Ep. Pelag. 2. ap. *Lab.* col. 621.

(*i*) Vide not. in vit. *Pelag.* 1. *Lab.* col. 788.

(*k*) *Pelag.* 1. Ep. 3. *Lab.* col. 792. *Baron. An.* 566. pag. 453.

It is well, when *de Marca* reſolves to ſupport the tottering credit of this Pope, that he hath no better Evidence of *Theodorus* of *Cæſarea*'s favouring Hereticks, than *Facundus* a condemned Neſtorian, and *Liberatus* who writes ſo partially for that ſide; it is plain, their ſpite to *Theodorus* was for his zeal againſt *Neſtorius*, and for giving the Emperor that wholſome and neceſſary advice, to condemn all thoſe Men and their Writings under which the Neſtorians ſheltered themſelves; and it is ſhewed before that he was no favourer either of *Origen* (*l*), or the *Acephali*.

Num. iv. *Lab.* col. ead.

(*l*) See the Hiſtory chap. 23.

Yet

Num. v. *Lab.* ib.

Yet this defender of *Vigilius* reflects on *Juſtinian*'s Edict, approved by a General Council, upon the ſingle Teſtimony of a convicted Heretick, who writes ſo bitterly againſt the Truth, that he is not to be believed nor eſteemed as any thing but a bigotted and provoked Adverſary: Only our Author paſſes by one thing, which is, that *Facundus* and *Liberatus* both Rail at *Vigilius*, for deſerting their Party, and look upon him after his coming to the Emperor as one that took the Heretical ſide, which ſhews they knew nothing of his latter change *. As to what he ſaith, *That there was nothing of Faith controverted in this Council, but only concerning Perſons*, This is fully anſwered before (*m*): And I will only note the weakneſs of this diſtinction; For what difference is there between condemning a Mans Heretical Opinions, and condemning that Man for holding thoſe Opinions? Suppoſe the Arians ſhould pretend, that becauſe *Arius* was condemned at *Nice*, the Controverſie there was about a Perſon, not about the Faith, Will *de Marca* allow that diſtinction? And the like may be ſaid of *Macedonius*, *Eutyches* and *Neſtorius* in former Councils: Certain it is, that in this Council the Writings or Opinions of *Theodorus* and his Perſon alſo are condemned, and ſo are the Opinions of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* before their Recantation, but not their Perſons; and the main Queſtion in the fifth Council, Whether thoſe Writings of theſe three there cited were Heretical? which I think is a matter of Faith and not of Perſons.

* Diſſertat. infr. Num. viii. col. 604.

(*m*) See the Hiſt. chap. 5.

Num. vi. *Lab.* col. 604.

Wherefore, ſince the Neſtorian Hereticks gloried in theſe Writings, the Queſtion whether they ſhould be condemned or no, was not (as he pretended) concerning diſcipline; and ſo there is no room for his impertinent diſtinction of κατ' οἰκονομίαν, unleſs *Vigilius* had a Diſpenſation to defend Heretical Writings; and his wavering was not prudence, but perfidiouſneſs in ſuch a Caſe.

Facundus

Facundus may be a good witneſs that *Vigilius* confirmed the three Chapters, before his coming to *Conſtantinople*, and perhaps he might ſuſpend *Mennas* after his coming to that City, (as *de Marca* out of *Theophanes* ſaith). But ſince *Mennas* died that very year, as is proved by the Acts of the ſixth Council at *Conſtantinople*, where they muſt needs know the time of their own Patriarchs death, but in the preceding Century (*n*), All the reſt of his Story is manifeſt Forgery, *viz.* his delivering his Decree to *Mennas*, *An.* 548. (after he was dead) and he would prove this by a meer and groſs impoſture, which is *Vigilius* Epiſtle to *Theodorus*, where in *September*, 552 (*o*), the Pope is made to Excommunicate *Theodorus* and ſuſpend *Mennas*, (who had been dead five year:) Yet in another forged Epiſtle ſet down at large in *Labbè* (*p*), in *February* the year before, the ſame Pope tells the Catholick Church, he had excommunicated and depoſed *Theodorus* and the other ſix Months ago: Yet theſe apparent Fictions *de Marca* gravely cites as good Evidence, and in truth he hath no other Teſtimonies but theſe two ſpurious Epiſtles, and the incoherent ſtuff of *Anaſtaſius* Biblioth. to prove that *Vigilius* was perſecuted by *Juſtinian* at all, or that he ever oppoſed him after he came to the City of *Conſtantinople* till the Council met. *De Marca* grants *Facundus* after this called him a Prevaricator; and we find (about that very time, wherein thoſe ſham Epiſtles lay the Scene of *Juſtinian*'s perſecuting him, for Excommunicating *Theodorus*, and the Condemners of the three Chapters,) by good Evidence under *Vigilius* own Hand, that this Pope Excommunicated two Roman Deacons, for defending the three Chapters (*p*), full three year after his coming to *Juſtinian*: So that this learned Author ſhould not bring ſuch ſtuff in for Evidence. Yet again he quotes an Epiſtle of the Roman Clergy *to the Legatories*, now newly publiſhed (*q*), which is as palpable an impoſture as any of the former;

Num. vii. *Lab.* ib. & Num. vi. ib.

(*n*) Concil. vi. Act. 3. *Bin.* Tom. 3. par. 1. pag. 21 & notis ibid. pag. 264.

(*o*) Vid. fragm. Epiſt. *Vigil.* *Lab.* col. 337.

(*p*) Epiſt. 15. *Vigil. Lab.* col. 328, &c. vid. dat. Epiſt. col. 334.

(*p*) Vid. 2. Epiſt. *Vigilij.* recit. in Concil. 5 Act. 7. *Lab.* col. 550, &c. *Baron. An.* 550.

(*q*) Ep. Legatariis *An.* 552. *Lab.* col. 407.

For

For therein the Clergy of *Italy* tell a long Story to the French Legates upon hear-ſay, to inform them what *Vigilius* was then doing and ſuffering at *Conſtantinople*, where theſe Legates then were; and whereas they might ſo eaſily have informed *France* of this by Letters from *Rome*, they deſire the Legates to write this from *Conſtantinople* to the Gallican Church. Again, theſe rare Clerks ſay, that *Dacius* Biſhop of *Milan* had been abſent from his Church 15 or 16 year, till all the Biſhops of his ordaining were dead, ſo that vaſt multitudes died for want of Baptiſm, (it ſeems neither Lay-men nor Presbyters might then Baptize:) But if *Dacius* did fly from *Milan* when it was taken by the Goths *(r)*, and never viſited them till now, he had been abſent but 13 year at moſt; but that ſtay is not probable, conſidering how good a Biſhop he was.

(r) *Baron. An.* 539. pag. 239.

Num. ix. *Lab.* col. 605.

The long Hiſtory therefore of *Vigilius* his returning to his Vomit, and of his being perſecuted by *Juſtinian*, depending on nothing but forged relations, is to be wholly rejected; and that Letter which *Eutychius* writ to *Vigilius*, to have the three Chapters condemned in a lawful Council, whereunto *Vigilius* by Letter conſented in *January* 553 *(s)*, was not writ upon *Eutychius* firſt promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople*, in which he had ſat now almoſt ſix years, (being choſen immediately upon the death of *Mennas*,) but was writ purely on occaſion of the deſigned Council; and the Patriarch profeſſeth his Faith in it, not on the account of his entrance on his promotion, but to remove the ſcandal, which the Neſtorians laid upon ſuch as condemned the three Chapters, as if they did not aſſent to the former Councils, eſpecially that of *Chalcedon*.

(s) Vid. Epiſtol. Concil. 5. collat. 1. *Lab.* col. 424.

Num. x. *Lab.* ibid.

Vigilius only covered his Neſtorian principles with theſe ſhifts, and his main Argument of the paucity of Weſtern Biſhops, is abundantly confuted by the Councils, ſhewing there were more of them preſent then at *Conſtantinople*, than had been in any former General Council. And the event ſhewed, that neither

neither his abſence nor diſſenting could hinder this, which our Author wrongfully calls *an imperfect meeting*, from being univerſally received as a General Council.

The Conſtitution of *Vigilius* is proved Heretical before (*t*), and *de Marca* gives a very weak reaſon to prove it was not read in the fifth Council. For how could *Juſtinian* be ſo ſilly, as to ſuppoſe he could keep the Biſhops then aſſembled ignorant of *Vigilius* his averſion to condemning the three Chapters, when he would not come at them, (and if *de Marca* ſay true) ſuffered ſuch injuries for defending them? 'tis plain they knew his Mind, and do particularly confute his Conſtitution, only ſparing his name; yea, 'tis Evident, they lookt on him as a fickle Man, and publiſhed nothing but his firſt and ſoundeſt Judgment, and never ceaſed acting vigorouſly for all his diſſent; for the Greeks at *Chalcedon* had ſhewed, they looked on a Councils Decrees as valid, though the Pope oppoſed them. Numb. xi & xii. *Lab.* col. 606.

(*t*) See the Hiſtor chap. 6, &c.

After all he hath no Witneſſes of his Exile, but the fabulous *Anaſtaſius*; all the Greeks (he confeſſes) are ſilent as to his ſufferings, and ſo are all Authentick Latin Hiſtories too. The Epiſtle of *Peter* of *Antioch* was writ 500 year after, and only ſpeaks of ſome difference between *Vigilius* and *Mennas*, which muſt be at his firſt coming to *Conſtantinople Anno* 547, but that is nothing to this time after the Council. Num. xiii. *Lab.* col. 607.

It ſeems ſtrange, that *Vigilius* ſhould paſs for ſo great a Politician by the art uſed in this Epiſtle; for if it were his, I ſhould think he never intended to confirm the fifth Council by it, becauſe he never names it; which ſilence muſt proceed either from his fear to anger the Weſtern Biſhops, with whom he joyned ſtill in heart, or from his hope that the bare recanting his Opinions, would cajole the Emperor and his Greeks; and if we conſider his Hypocriſie and often changes, both of theſe might make him Numb. xiv. *Lab.* col. 609.

omit the naming the fifth Council: But being a Forgery, we need not any conjectures about the reaſon of a non-entity: Yet if I were convinced *Vigilius* writ this Epiſtle, I ſhould believe the date was falſe, and that this was his firſt Recantation after he came to *Conſtantinople* before this Synod met, which is the moſt probable reaſon, why he did not name this fifth Synod, *viz.* becauſe no ſuch had yet been.

Numb. xv. ib. It was not the Greeks, but the Latins who put this Epiſtle to the end of the Acts of the fifth Synod, for in their Vatican it was firſt pretended to be found; but whoever added it, muſt be very weak to imagin an unlawful Synod could be confirmed by a Popes private Opinion delivered ſix months after, or that any body elſe ſhould receive a Council upon his Authority, who did not own it himſelf. *Photius* lived 300 year after this Council had been owned for a General Council, and what he ſaith may well be explained of the Letters of his which were read in the Council, importing that once he was of their mind. The Arabick Manuſcript is ſo full of miſtakes, that its Authority muſt be inconſiderable; it ſays, that the living and dead were never excommunicated before this Synod, and that the Popes profeſſion of Faith was writ not to *Eutychius*, but to the Emperor *Juſtinian:* And all theſe Teſtimonies amount to no more, than that which the Emperor and the Council both gave out, that *Vigilius* was (as indeed he had often declared) of the Councils Opinion.

Numb. xvi. *Lab.* col. 610. 'Tis certain *Pelagius* the firſt, *Vigilius* his immediate ſucceſſor, and who was with him at *Conſtantinople*, did own this for a General Council; and if *Vigilius* had changed his mind, (as *Pelagius* had done) ſo as to confirm the fifth Council, he muſt have known of it, and for his own vindication would have pleaded this Writing of *Vigilius*, to ſatisfie the Weſtern Biſhops who rejected his Communion; and his ſilence of

of *Vigilius* consent and confirmation, is next to demonstration, that he knew of no such thing, and that no such thing ever was: As for all the rest they owned it for a lawful General Council, but not one of them knew of the subsequent consent of *Vigilius*.

The next thing in *de Marca* is, the consideration of the reasons moving *Vigilius* to make this Decree, the first of which is notoriously false; For this forged Epistle saith, *that now the whole World and the Church was restored to Peace* (*u*), and our Author thinks the Illyrican and African Bishops, were now reconciled to the Condemners of the three Chapters: Whereas 'tis plain, *Liberatus* did not write his Breviary till *Vigilius* his death, that is, two year after the date of this feigned Epistle; and he shews how woful a Schism and Scandal there was then in the Church, especially in *Africa* (*w*). And *Victor* one of the African Bishops of that side, died in restraint, after he had suffered much in defence of the three Chapters thirteen years after (*x*). As to the Western Bishops, how could their being restored to Peace be a motive to *Vigilius* to recant *An.* 553. when three year after, his successor *Pelagius* was struggling with them to bring them to Peace, and could not do it then without some force (*y*)? And our Author owns, that the French, Spanish and Italian Bishops, did not come in till *Pelagius* had been some time in the Chair; and *Baronius* saith the same (*z*), so that his first reason is not so much as true: I shall only add that *Justinian* acted very sincerely in this matter, and *Leontius* slanders him in supposing otherwise; for his Judgment was, that the three Chapters were to be condemned, both Opinions and Persons, the Heretical Doctrins and Hereticks too, if they had not recanted.

Numb. xvii. *Lab.* ibid.

(*u*) Epist. *Vigil. Lab.* col. 597.

(*w*) *Liberat.* Brev. cap. 24. *Bin.* pag. 193. *Lab.* col. 778.

(*x*) *Baron. An.* 566. in fine &c *An.* 553. pag. 435.

(*y*) Vid. Epist. 3. *Pelag.* 1. *Lab.* col. 792.

(*z*) *Baron. An.* 556. pag. 452. n. 1.

Num. xviii. *Lab.* col. 611. But perhaps *Vigilius* might act dispensatively in this change, for it is likely he still kept a Nestorian Heart, only this spoils his second reason, why *Vigilius* writ this Epistle, *viz. Christ having enlightned his Mind, God revealing, and he diligently enquiring was now come to the knowledge of the Truth* (a). For if after all, *Vigilius* did only confirm them dispensatively, that supposes he did not believe the points to be either necessary or true, but only such as might be professed for peace sake; and if that were all, what an Hypocrite must this Pope be, to talk of a change of his Mind, and coming to know the truth by Illumination, Revelation and Study? In vain doth he and his Patron alledge the Example of St. *Augustin*, St. *Paul* and St. *Peter*; for did St. *Augustin* retract things, and pretend to be convinced of his Mistakes only dispensatively, that is, secretly believing still they might be true? Did St. *Paul* only believe the Gospel κατ' οἰκονομίαν, after his Conversion; Or was St. *Peter* a *Jew* in his Heart, after he consented to discharge the Gentiles from the Ceremonies of the Law? *Pelagius* the Second's Arguments are good as to the Roman Clergy, who sincerely opposed the truth for a time, but upon Conviction as sincerely embraced it: But to apply these instances to such a Proteus and Dissembler as *Vigilius*, is to prostitute them, rather than defend him, who often dispensed with himself in the duties of Morality.

(a) Epist. *Vigil. Lab.* col. 597.

Num. xix & xx. *Lab.* 611. If *Vigilius* had gon to the Council he might have learned those two Rules *de Marca* speaks of, in six days, without the help of Revelation: But the feigned Epistle says nothing of such Rules; it pretends that *Vigilius* now understood the Person and Writings of *Theodorus*, and the Writings of *Theodoret* and *Ibas* against *Cyril* were Heretical, and that it was his duty to pronounce them Heretical, and condemn them as such; yea, Anathematize them; and is this only a point of Ecclesiastical Discipline? May Hereticks and their

their Opinions be either condemned or not? and is it an indifferent thing, whether a Pope abſolve and defend, or accurſe and condemn in ſuch caſes? Surely the great name of *de Marca* is forged and put to this weak tract; he would not have argued at this rate.

That the Acts of this Council were early tranſ- Num. xxi.
lated into Latin for the uſe of the Weſtern Church, *Lab.* col. 612.
is probable enough; but *Vigilius* needed not this Tranſlation; he had lived at *Conſtantinople* long before he was Pope, and now ſix years together after he was Pope, and ſo muſt underſtand Greek perfectly: But the true reaſon why *Vigilius* Epiſtle was not added to theſe Latin Acts, was becauſe there was no ſuch Epiſtle then invented: For had he then writ ſuch an Epiſtle, or in ſix Months after, it would certainly have been joyned to both the Greek and Latin Copies for all Mens ſatisfaction who were ſcandalized by his diſſent, eſpecially if that (which *de Marca* ſuppoſes) had been thought true in thoſe Ages, *viz.* That the Decrees of a General Council were invalid without the Popes Confirmation: But this is an Opinion of later Birth.

Whatever he ſaith in defence of the ſincerity of Num. xxii.
the Latin Acts, I agree to; but ſince he borrows *Lab.* ib.
from *Crakenthorp*, not only his Arguments, but his conjectures alſo, (ſuch as altering the name of *Domnus* into *John*, *&c.*) I muſt believe the Author of this diſcourſe had ſeen *Crakenthorp*'s learned Hiſtory of the fifth Council, yet durſt not own it, becauſe he could not confute it.

From the ſame Author he borrows much of what Num. xxiii, &c.
he ſays, about condemning *Origen*'s Opinions in this *Lab.* col. 613.
Council: But ſince the Council was riſen, before *Vigilius* began to deliberate whether he ſhould receive their Acts or no, (yea, and their Acts as he thinks tranſlated into Latin alſo,) how could *Juſtinian* after this ſend to the diſſolved Council, to know their Judgment of *Origen* and his Followers? Therefore *de*

Marca

Marca miſtakes the point; and the learned *Crakenthorp* ſolves this difficulty much better (*b*), to which I refer the Reader; And only will enquire how this Author and thoſe Popes he cites could truly ſay, that no matters of Faith were handled in this fifth Council, if *Origen* and his Heretical Opinions were here condemned, as he goes about to prove? This is a manifeſt contradiction. The Senſe of thoſe Popes and others muſt be, no Points of Faith decided at *Chalcedon*, were called in Queſtion over again here: For the Queſtion only was, whether the Opinions in the three Chapters were not condemned in the Council of *Chalcedon*: And the fifth Council affirming this concerning the Opinions of three Perſons, did not (as ſome feared) decree any new, or different point of Faith from the Council of *Chalcedon*.

(*b*) See the Hiſt. Chap. xxviii.

Num. xxv. *Lab.* col. 614.

It is a needleſs thing to offer conjectures about the reaſon, why *Vigilius* in this Epiſtle doth not mention the condemning of *Origen*'s Errors; for the true reaſon is obvious, which is, Becauſe the Forger of this Epiſtle had nothing in his Eye, but to clear this Pope from the main thing he was charged with, *viz.* defending three Heretical Chapters, and that point he makes out: I grant he had (yet only joyntly with other Patriarchs, and by following, not leading *Juſtinian*) condemned *Origen* before, as *Liberatus* declares (*c*): But I muſt note, that *Liberatus* his telling us that ſo particularly, and ſaying nothing of *Vigilius* his Epiſtle to condemn the three Chapters, is a ſhrewd ſuſpicion there was no ſuch Epiſtle, ſince *Liberatus* writ after *Vigilius* death, and was a favourer of the three Chapters, and writ all that he thought might diſparage ſuch as condemned them. To conclude, either the Authority of the Pope was not ſo conſiderable in thoſe days, as this learned Apologiſt fancies, or *Vigilius* his carriage was ſuch, that no body enquired what ſide he was of, after his ſo often turnings; ſince he lived above two years

(*c*) *Liberat.* Breviar. cap. 23.

years after this Council, and yet no mention in any genuine Writer is made where he was, or how he carried himſelf to the time of his death, which is ſaid to have hapned in *Sicily*, *An.* 555. So little a figure did the Roman Pontiff then make; and when the Controverſie was revived in the time of *Pelagius* the Second, and *Gregory* the Great, they choſe to bury *Vigilius* name in ſilence, his inconſtancy to his Principles and evil Practices having made it the intereſt of the Roman Church to clap him under Hatches ſo long as his Character was remembred; and this Apologiſt had better have followed their Policy, than to raiſe him (as he hath done) only to his greater ſhame.

Books

Books printed for, and Sold by R. Clavel, *at the* Peacock *in St.* Paul's *Church-yard.*

THE Reaſons of Praying for the Peace of our *Jeruſalem*: In a Sermon Preached before the Queen at *White-Hall*, on the *Faſt-Day*, being Wedneſday *Auguſt* 29. 1694. by *Thomas Comber*, D.D. Dean of *Durham*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to their Majeſties. *Printed by Their Majeſties Special Command.*

A Daily Office for the Sick; Compil'd out of the Holy Scriptures, and the Liturgy of our Church; with occaſional Prayers, Meditations and Directions.

The Catechiſm of the Church with proofs from the New Teſtament, and ſome additional Queſtions and Anſwers, divided into 12 Sections by *Zach. Iſham*, D. D Author of the Book lately publiſhed, Entituled a Daily Office for the Sick, with directions, &c.

A Church Catechiſm with a brief and eaſie Explanation thereof, for the help of the Meaneſt Capacities and Weakeſt Memories, in order to the eſtabliſhing them in the Religion of the Church of *England*, by *T. C.* Dean of *D.*

The *Pantheon*, Repreſenting the Fabulous Hiſtories of the Heathen Gods, and moſt Illuſtrious Heroes; in a ſhort, plain and familiar Method, by way of Dialogue, for the Uſe of Schools. Written by *Fra. Pomey*, of the Society of Jeſus; Author of the *French* and *Latin* Dictionary, for the Uſe of the *Dauphin.*

Bedæ Venerabilis opera Quædam Theologica, nunc primùm edita, necnon Hiſtorica, antea ſemel edita. Acceſſerunt Egberti Archiepiſcopi Eboracenſis Dialogus de Eccleſiaſticâ Inſtitutione & Aldhelmi Epiſcopi Scireburnenſis Liber de Virginitate ex Codice antiquiſſimo emendatus.

Diſquiſitio in Hypotheſin *Baxterianam* de Fœdere Gratiæ, Ab initio & deinceps, ſemper & ubique omnibus indulto, & adhuc apud Ethnicos & extra-evangelicos vigente ac valente ad ſalutem. Authore Carolo Robothamo, Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ Presbytero Norfolcienſi, *S. Th. B.*

Q. Horatii Flacci Opera: Interpretatione & Notis Illuſtravit *Ludovicus Deſprez* Cardinalitius Socius ac Rhetor Emeritus, Juſſu Chriſtianiſſimi Regis, in uſum Sereniſſimi Delphini, ac Sereniſſimorum Principum Burgundiæ, Andium, Biturigum. Huic Editioni acceſſere Vita Horatii, cum *Dacerii* Notis ejuſdem Chronologia Horatiana, & Præfatio de *Satira Romana.*

L. Annæi Flori rerum Romanarum Epitome; Interpretatione & Notis Illuſtravit Anna Tanaquilla Fabri Tilia, Juſſu Chriſtianiſſimi Regis, in uſum *Sereniſſimi Delphini.*

Compendium *Græcum* Novi Teſtamenti, Continens ex 7959. Verſiculis totius N. Teſtamenti tantum Verſiculos 1900. (non tamen integros) in quibus omnes univerſi Novi Teſt. Voces, una cum Verſione Latina, Inveniuntur: Auctore, *Johanne Luſden.* Philoſ. Doctore, & Linguæ Sanctæ in Academia Ultrajectina Profeſſore Ordinario. Editio Quinta.

FINIS.